THE EMPIRE CLUB ADDRESSES

1946-47

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1946unse

MAJOR F. L. CLOUSE

President of The Empire Club of Canada, for 1946-47

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE
YEAR 1946-47

Forty-fourth year of Issue

GOD SAVE THE KING

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LTD.,
TORONTO, CANADA.

Copyright, Canada, 1947
The Empire Club of Canada

YEAR BOOK PUBLISHING COMMITTEE,
1946-47

Lieut.-Col. John Hyde Bennett
Sydney Hermant (Chairman)
L. A. Winter

PRINTED IN CANADA
T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED, TORONTO

“OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE”

YEAR 1946-47

Honorary President:

His Excellency the Right Honourable The Earl of Athlone,
K.G., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., D.S.O., V.D.,
Governor-General of Canada

President: Major F. L. Clouse
First Vice-President: Tracy E. Lloyd
Second Vice-President: H. G. Haynes
Third Vice-President: George Hardy
Honorary Secretary: Ford Ralph
Secretary: Lieut.-Col. John Hyde Bennett
Treasurer: W. W. Comber, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

Col. F. F. Arnoldi
H. C. Bourlier
Chas. Byford
Major E. F. Coke
J. A. Cole
Horace Harpham
Warren B. Hastings
Sydney Hermant
T. H. Howse
G. A. Lascelles
J. Q. Maunsell, K.C.
Brig. F. Beverley Matthews, K.C.
J. P. Pratt, K.C.
T. A. Pugsley
Lieut.-Col. H. C. Tutte (S.A.)
L. A. Winter

Immediate Past President:

Eric F. Thompson

Past Presidents:

W. Eason Humphries
C. R. Conquergood
J. F. M. Stewart

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY

AND

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society of London, England, and The Empire Club of Canada at Toronto were both founded for a single purpose and with a common aim:—The strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire. This mutual objective is prosecuted with vigorous enthusiasm by the members of these organizations on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

CONTENTS

FRONTISPIECE - - - - - - - - - ii

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1946-47 - v

AIMS AND AFFILIATION - - - - - - vi

MAJOR RT. HON. ANTHONY EDEN, P.C., M.C., J.P., B.L.,
"An Address" - - - - - - - - 1

HIS EXCELLENCY, VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF TUNIS
"An Address" - - - - - - - - 8

SIR WILLIAM CLARK, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., D.C.L.,
"The Progress and Prospects in Britain" - - 15

DR. JACOB MARKOWITZ, M.B.E., M.B., PH.D., M.S.,
"Some Experiences as a Medical Officer with the Royal Army Medical Corps" - - - - - - 27

STUART ARMOUR,
"Do We Face Ideological Conquest" - - - 42

HON. WILLIAM J. STEWART, O.B.E.,
"CITIZENSHIP" - - - - - - - - 57

GEORGE S. MATHIESON,
"The State of Foreign Trade" - - - - - - 70

LORD INVERCLYDE,
"Heroes of The British Merchant Fleet" - - 87

THE HON. THOMAS D. PATTULLO, K.C., LL.D.,
"Dominion-Provincial Relations" - - - - - 98

PROFESSOR REGINALD G. TROTTER, M.A., PH.D., D.C.L.,
"Canada's Partnership in Freedom" - - - - 109

DR. ELWOOD S. MOORE, PH.D., M.A.,
"The Royal Society Empire Scientific Conference" - - - - - - - - - - 122

WILLSON WOODSIDE,
"Inside Spain Today" - - - - - - - 131

ETTORE MAZZOLENI, B.A., B.MUS.,
"Music and Peace" - - - - - - - 149

DR. SIDNEY EARLE SMITH, K.C., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L.,
"Your University and Canada's Finest Generation" - - - - - - - - - - 157

MAJOR-GENERAL D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.,
"The Broader Aspects of Scouting" - - - 167

MR. DONALD WOLFIT,
"Shakespeare in War and Peace" - - - - 174

LIEUTENANT J. E. R. WOOD, M.C.,
"The Inception and Production of Detour" - - 188

RIGHT HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE, P.C. (CAN.), B.SC.,
"Canada's Coal Problem" - - - - - - 200

PROFESSOR T. CUYLER YOUNG, M.A., TH.B.,
"Iran's Current Problems" - - - - - 212

WING COMMANDER JOHN F. MCCREARY, M.D., R.C.A.F.,
"The Condition of Civilians in Western Europe at the Conclusion of the German Occupation" - 228

MR. R. W. KEYSERLINGK,
"What is Canada's Position in The World Today?" - 245

THE RT. HON. FRANCIS MICHAEL FORDE, P.C.,
"British Commonwealth" - 256

DR. ROBERT BAIRD McCLURE, M.D., F.R.C.S.,
"Canada's Place in The Pacific Basin" - 269

MICHAEL BARKWAY,
"Report on Britain" - 279

MR. SOLON E. LOW,
"The Commonwealth That Will Endure" - 289

COLONEL, THE VEN. ARCHDEACON A. P. GOWER-REES, M.A., D.C.L., M.C.,
"Has The British Empire Completed Its Task?" - 305

DR. E. T. SALMON, M.A., PH.D.,
"The Making of The Peace" - 316

BRIGADIER CHARLES M. DRURY, D.S.O., M.B.E.,
"U.N.R.R.A. in Poland" - 331

"ANNUAL MEETING" - 345

MR. JOHN ERSKINE,
"Ideals of Music in The New World" - 349

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT - 360

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS - 362

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1947-48 - 364

CONSTITUTION - 365

MEMBERSHIP - 371

The opinions and views expressed in the Addresses, contained in this volume, are those of the speakers themselves and do not necessarily carry the full or partial endorsement of The Empire Club of Canada.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

AN ADDRESS

BY

MAJOR RT. HON. ANTHONY EDEN,
P.C., M.C., J.P., B.L.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clause

Thursday, June 27, 1946

MAJOR CLAUSE: Gentlemen—Following grace with Canon Cody—will you kindly remain standing while we sing the first verse of the National Anthem—and then drink a toast to His Majesty, The King.

Mr. Prime Minister, Gentlemen of The Canadian Club of Toronto—of the Empire Club of Canada—and ladies and gentlemen of our audience of the air—Today marks a highlight in the annals of these Clubs and we feel particularly privileged in meeting here today—through the courtesy of the Prime Minister of this Province, Colonel George Drew—to pay our respects to one of the British Empire's greatest statesmen; a man who has, in his relatively short but very prominent career, shouldered so successfully many of the most difficult and harassing diplomatic assignments of our time. If, Sir, I may paraphrase your remarks at the time of the Munich debate—

> "Every citizen owes to you a measureless debt of gratitude for your sincerity and pertinacity".

A scholar, soldier, author, Parliamentarian and statesman—the counselor and confidant of Prime Ministers and of Kings. Gentlemen—Major, The Right Honourable Anthony Eden, P.C., M.C., J.P., D.C.L.

MAJOR RT. HON. ANTHONY EDEN: Mr. President, Mr. Premier and Gentlemen: It would indeed be an unimaginative man who was not impressed by the size of this gathering and the warmth of the welcome you have so generously extended to me. I do indeed feel a friend among friends, and I thank you the more cordially for that welcome because I know that it isn't offered to me, personally, but to me as a citizen of a small island across the sea.

Gentlemen, it has been a heartening experience for me to be in Canada these last few days and, may I say in particular, this morning I enjoyed the privilege of meeting my old friend and your Premier, Mr. George Drew, once again.

As in these days I have been in your great cities and flown over your beautiful and fertile countryside, again and again I have thought you in Canada have indeed a great country, a land of promise and of unrivalled opportunity, and I have thought too in these days of another occasion on the Clyde, now nearly six and a half years ago when with my friend, Vincent Massey, we watched the sun slowly breaking through the gray skies and lighting up one of the largest armadas that ever sailed into that great river. That armada carried the first contingent of your Forces to Britain, and there are men here, I know, who from that day until a few weeks past or a few months past have been away from home, playing their part in this titanic struggle.

I looked over the ships that were there—ships like the Empress of Britain, the pride of your Merchant Marine, which now, unhappily, suffered in the contest, and I remember too the troops that were there. Your own 48th Highlanders—and I remember that as Mr. Massey and I stood there on the deck of the Warspite, we had a feeling that here indeed was a partnership in a common struggle.

May I say to this gathering how proud I am that Vincent Massey should be with us on this occasion. (Applause.) I think it is his first public appearance in Toronto since he ceased to be your High Commissioner in London, and I think it is fitting that I, to whom it fell to do so much work with him, should tell you that there is no man in either of our lands who has made a fuller, a more sincere contribution to understanding between our two countries than has Vincent Massey. (Applause.)

There are other memories of those days—the arrival of your other regiments—the Queen's Own Regiment, the Toronto Scottish and others, and there is also the memory of the part played, not only then but throughout the war years, by the Royal Canadian Air Force, and—let it not be forgotten—the part played by the Royal Canadian Navy.

Whatever our thoughts today may be, this at least is certain, that you and I would not be gathered together in this room but for the part played by our Air Forces together in the Battle of Britain, and but for the work of the Navies and the Merchant Marine in keeping the seas open in those critical years. Gentlemen, our debt to the men who go down to the sea in ships must never be forgotten.

I have often heard it said that in the modern world, you here in Canada have a special part to play, as the interpreter, by reason of your exceptional knowledge both of the United States and of the United Kingdom. That, no doubt, is true. But I suggest to you that it is only a part of the story. Quite apart from Canada's position as interpreter, Canada has an important and constructive contribution to make on her own account. In world affairs, Canada is indeed now a principal in her own right. She has emerged from this war as one of the leading nations of the world.

Each one of us in this room has, I think, this in common, that we have a deep and an abiding faith in the British Commonwealth and Empire, a faith in the future, a faith in the contribution it can make and will make, please God, toward security and progress in the world.

Now, Sir, ours is not a faith that we seek to thrust down the throats of others, but we believe in our faith and we believe in it because it is founded on Freedom.

The British Commonwealth probably is not easy to define. It is probably none the worse for that. Good things are always hard to define, but it is an association of free people. Nobody compels anyone of us to belong to it. We belong to it because we like it better to live in that way, because we share common faith and loyalties and treasure them. But there is more to it, I suggest, than that. We believe in freedom and equality, not only between ourselves but within ourselves, and by that I mean that we believe in man's freedom and in his individuality. We believe in full religious toleration. We recognize each man's right to worship in the church of his own choice. We believe in the equality of citizens before the law.

These, Gentlemen, are the fundamentals of our faith and I repeat them to you now, because it is only by hearing them that we can realize those magic words of the American Declaration of Independence: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.

Now, I said just now that we do not seek to impose our conception of our way of life upon others. That is quite true, but equally, we must not be shy or timid in proclaiming our faith. The world of today has need of just that message. There is much to grieve us, much to make us anxious as we look at the present international scene. Scarcely a day passed without fresh evidence that the Allies of the common battlefield of eighteen months ago are still further at odds. Even for those who place their hopes of international collaboration in these post-war years on a very modest basis, even for those, disappointment must be keen. In war we found a common unity—to resist and overthrow aggression. We contrived to work and fight together. We devised a common strategy which we pursued together to a victorious end. How bitter it is that for the tasks of peace we fall so short of that unity which won the war.

Sometimes when one reads the international discussions and the sharp polemics which support them on either side, it almost seems as though the world had forgotten that just a short while ago, Britishers and Canadians, Russians and Americans, Frenchmen and Chinese, and so many others of the United Nations were laying down their lives in the hope that when victory was won, peace could finally be established on the basis of respect for international engagements and acceptance of the rule of law.

Now, Gentlemen, in the face of these disappointments, what should we do? Clearly we must hold to our course. The more unsettled world conditions, the more firmly must we cleave to our faith and hold by the engagement into which we have entered to keep the peace.

Now, I am sure neither you, nor any of the peoples of the British Commonwealth and Empire, nor the people of the United States wish to be exclusive in their friendship. The door is open to all. We know that full happiness cannot accrue to our peoples unless all the United Nations work together.

Let me give an example. Take the relations of my own country with the Soviet Union and with the United States. Who doubts we could reach true understanding on the problems of the day? There is no international issue that could not peacefully be resolved between us. Who can also doubt that if that understanding is not reached and maintained, not one of the people of those three countries would enjoy either full security for the present or full confidence in the future?

Those are the problems that beset us. But if we can't find full unity, strive much as we try to achieve it, we must hold to our faith and strive for the friendships of those who are like-minded with us. If we will do this, in the end I am sure that all will be well, despite the anxieties and the disappointments of the present time.

I refuse to be a pessimist about the future. Just look at the opportunities for good. They are so immeasurable if the nations could only contrive to see things that way and to work together to realize them. If we will put first things first, if we will hold to our faith, not as a threat to others, but as a daily inspiration to our own life, if we will make plain that neither our friendship nor our faith are exclusive, but that the doors are open to all, if we are firm but cool and reasoning, we shall win through.

Gentlemen, I make no apology to you for saying one special word about our relations, the British Commonwealth and the countries of the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. I know neither we, nor you, nor the United States desire that friendship to be exclusive. We want others to come in too to the same friendship on equal terms. Yet it is important, whenever opportunity offers to do everything that lies in our power to promote understanding between the United States and the peoples of the British Commonwealth.

That is why I was glad the other day that the chance came to me to go to this informal meeting at Bermuda where there were representatives from your Parliament, from ours, from New Zealand, from Bermuda itself, and eight Senators and members of the House of Representatives from the United States. Our meetings were quite informal. We had no resolutions. We had no set speeches. But I have no doubt that as a result of that meeting, as a result of those discussions, we were able to undertand better each other's point of view. Certain misunderstandings were removed and we went back to our respective countries with the better interpretation of those with whom we had worked in those days.

How good it would be if we could only extend that principle, if it were possible with other countries to work in that way. It isn't only the friendship of statesmen that count, though God knows that is important enough, but all the way down, understanding between the people is the only foundation of lasting peace. The wider that understanding can be stretched the more peoples it can cover, the greater the opportunities for peace.

I hope with time others will see matters that way too, but even if they do not, it does not decrease our own obligation to do all that we can in our own way with those who are willing to partake of discussions with us.

My Friends, before I conclude, will you let me say one word about Canada. Your country has a brilliant record in these war years, and I know what this Province of Ontario has contributed to two world wars, and I think it not unfair to say that the contribution of the British Empire on both those occasions has been not unworthy of our past and is one in which our later descendants can take pride. Your sons, I know, have performed countless feats of valour on the battlefields of the world. I have no doubt that in peace too you will play your part. I pray that we together may help to lead the suffering world to the assured haven of an enduring peace.

These days it is hard for you or for me to open a newspaper or to turn on the radio without hearing of some new complexity, some new anxiety in the world life in which we live. But side by side with those forces and those anxieties are the great forces which make for better conditions for our people.

I felt so much agreement with something which I read that Sir Alexander Cadogan had said in a wireless talk yesterday: How important it is to give the United Nations Organization constructive tasks for peace to carry through and not merely to put before it controversies as they arise.

We have got to marshal the forces that make constructively for peace, wherever they may be, and they are immensely powerful, and however deep the disappointments may occasionally be, we must not lose heart. It is only by maintaining faith in our determination to win the peace as we won the war that we can be true to those who from your country and countless others went and returned not.

An Address By

HIS EXCELLENCY, VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF TUNIS

The Governor-General of Canada.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse.

Thursday, October 3rd, 1946

Major Clouse: Your Excellency, your Worship, our distinguished guests including those from Christie Street Military Hospital, all of whom served under Field Marshal Alexander, Gentlemen of the Canadian Club, of the Empire Club of Canada, and our audience of the air: It is a very outstanding day in the annals of our clubs when we are honored with presence of our Governor General. And this is an occasion of particular significance as His Excellency, Field Marshal the Viscount Alexander of Tunis, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., C.S.I., D.S.O., M.C., who is not only the patron and honorary president of the Empire Club of Canada but is also the patron of the Canadian Club, has graciously consented to address us.

We honor you, Sir, as the representative in Canada of His Majesty. And we also honor you, Sir, as an Officer holding supreme rank in the Army and one, who has fulfilled so ably those many difficult military assignments, the success of which has contributed so largely to the victory of our Allied Fighting Forces in the wars.

In Canada, Sir, you will find a nation loyal to the British Crown and to Christian democracy. And in this Dominion you will find no organizations of citizens more loyally inspired and working more assiduously to strengthen the bonds of unity within the Empire than the gentlemen you see before you.

Your Excellency, it is my privilege and my pleasure to introduce to you this audience as well as our audience of the air.

Will you, Sir, be pleased to address us.

HIS EXCELLENCY, VISCOUNT ALEXANDER: Mr. Chairman, Your Worship and Gentlemen: Let me first begin by thanking you for the very kind way in which you have received me. I am particularly happy to be here with you today as this enjoyable occasion allows me to fulfill an engagement which you were kind enough to extend to me over a year ago.

I also feel honoured to follow in the footsteps of those of my predecessors who have had the privilege of addressing you whilst they held office. But above all, I am happy to have this opportunity to meet so many of you and to add fresh names to my great list of Canadian friends.

In speaking to the members of both the Empire and Canadian Clubs, I think the fact that you are holding a joint meeting is evidence of a solidarity of views regarding the importance of Canada's position in the Commonwealth of Nations which cannot be better expressed than in the words of your own motto, "Canada and a United Empire."

I have now been in Canada for just six months, during which time I have been able to visit every Province of the Dominion. As regards to the Yukon and the North West Territories, I shall visit them next summer and I plan to see as much of them as time will allow and weather permit.

Since I landed in Canada on April 10th of this year I have travelled right across the country, both by rail and by air, both ways, from coast to coast, so I think I can claim that I have seen something of your life and activities.

Of the basic industries of this great country, I have visited mines, logging camps, sawmills, cotton mills, cement works, pulp and paper mills, fruit farms and fox farms. I have seen the great fishing grounds and the canning factories, and in fact I have caught my own fish and canned them, and I hope my friends in England to whom I have sent the fruits of my sporting experiences will enjoy them as much as I have done.

I have also visited farms in the prairies and seen the wheat handled and loaded onto the ships which have carried it to the Old Country where it is so greatly needed.

Of course I must admit that I have as yet seen only a little of the industrial life of Canada, and what I have seen is perhaps the best, but first impressions are generally pretty good and my first impressions are just that—pretty good.

I have been much impressed by the mechanical efficiency by which you deal with the rich resources at your disposal, and by the high standard of skill of the individual workers who handle this mechanical equipment.

It is for this reason, amongst many others, that I am much in favour of visits by responsible men from the British Isles to this country, because I believe that they can do well to come here and study your methods, because they have a great deal to learn from you.

In some fields, no doubt visits to Great Britain from this country would also prove profitable. This interchange between Canada and the Old Country can do nothing but good in exchanging ideas and developing trade.

As I see it, already a great deal has been done in this country to develop and exploit its natural wealth, yet there is little doubt that vast potential riches still remain to be discovered and exploited. Indications point to an ever increasing use of plastics in the modern world, and as I understand it, the basic foundation of plastics is cellulose. If this be so, then the forest industry will tend to become more and more important and no doubt greater use will be found for such wood as jack pine and small stuff which has so far not been considered very valuable.

This holds out tremendous possibilities for the future of forestry when we consider that there are already something like 4500 different uses for wood products that can be found.

Also, from what I learn, it is not unreasonable to suggest that there is a great future for the mining industry in this country where a large expanse of territory in the north still awaits survey and research. With modern means at our disposal this vast area must sooner or later yield us its secrets.

What a marvellous opportunity for adventure and discovery this holds out to us. But whatever line of development is undertaken we must encourage imagination, enterprise and initiative, or, in other words, the old pioneer spirit which has made this country what it is today.

Of course you will appreciate that in a short talk of this nature time does not permit me to do more than suggest a few ideas which have occurred to me as a result of my first impressions in your country. I will now pass on to another subject.

During my addresses to a number of Canadian Clubs I have told them something of the war, and I have found this to be of interest to my audience because so many have had sons or near relatives in the fighting overseas and indeed many of them have themselves served in the different theatres of operations during the war.

So, if you will allow me a little time, I should like to include you among the other clubs I have addressed and tell you something of the war which is not known to the general public at large and to a very few of those who were actually fighting our battles at the time.

Now, for example, the campaign in the Western Desert in 1942 which was opened by the Battle of Alamein was not only to relieve a Nazi threat to Egypt—it was much more ambitious than that—it was to eliminate Rommell together with his African Corps and Italian contingent from the Western Desert so that we could join forces with General Eisenhower who was going to land in North Africa, some two thousand miles away. The grand strategy at that time was to gain possession of the whole of the North African shore from Cairo to Casablanca so as to open up the Mediterranean to our shipping, and to get bases from which we could threaten the whole of Southern Europe or, in the words of Mr. Winston

Churchill, put us in a position to attack the soft underbelly of the Axis.

Six months after the victory at Alamein we had joined up with General Eisenhower in Tunisia, swept the Axis out of Africa, and were in possession of the whole of the North African shores from Alexandria to Gibralter, with all the ports and airfields at our disposal, and with a choice of invasion targets from the Aegean Sea to the Gulf of Lyons.

Two months later we invaded Sicily. Now, the selection of Sicily as our target was this: To establish a good jumping off point for the invasion of Southern Europe which would give us the choice of three things:

An invasion of the Balkans, an attack on the South of France, or an assault on the Italian mainland.

Well, as you know, Sicily was overrun in thirty-eight days, and Italy was then selected as our next target, for three main reasons:

First, to put Italy out of the war.

Secondly, to gain possession of the Foggia airfields from where we could base the large and growing fleet of Anglo-American heavy bombers for attacks on the Ploesti oil fields and other targets the Axis held in Europe. The Ploesti oil fields were vital to Hitler's war effort. You will remember or know that the Ploesti oil fields are in Rumania.

And, thirdly, to bring the German Army to battle. For, as Winston Churchill said in 1943, "We can't sit by and let the Russians do all the fighting."

Well, Gentlemen, all these objects were achieved by the successful Italian campaign which in 32 months of its duration brought to battle fifty odd German Divisions and cost the German Army 536,000 casualties, in killed, wounded and prisoners, and ended in the mass surrender of a million German soldiers and the collapse of the Nazis in Europe.

Now, it was in the Sicilian and Italian campaigns that your own soldiers, sailors and airmen were destined to play such a gallant and distinguished part.

Time does not permit me to mention all the great battles they fought and won, and in any case the magnificent record of the Canadians in the Mediterranean is well known to you. But in passing, may I say that the most outstanding battles which the Canadians fought and won after the successful operations in Sicily, were first, Ortona, which wrested from the enemy a key point in his winter line. This was soon followed by the famous battle of Ponte Corvo, which opened the road to Rome and that was again followed shortly after by the great battle which took place outside Rimini, which breached the Gothic line and put the 8th Army in the Valley of the Po where the final great battles of the war were fought to a successful conclusion.

Now, during the Italian campaign, I had something like twenty-four different nationalities under my Command, and it may interest you or, if it fails to interest you it may amuse you, if I give you a list. Now, among the Imperial and Allied formations—I say "formations" —that is from Brigade group, up to something much bigger, I had the following: British Corps, a Canadian Corps, a New Zealand Division, a South African Division, three Indian Divisions, a Polish Corps, a Palestinian Brigade, and a Greek Brigade. All these formed the 8th British Army.

Our Allies had an American Corps, which included a Negro Division, and a Japanese Combat Regiment; a French Corps, which included Algerians, Morrocans, Senegalese, Tunisians, and, of course, Free French.

And lastly, a Brazilian Division, and those went to make up the American Fifth Army.

But besides those, I had the specialized units, the administrative units—Newfoundlanders, Belgians, Basuto, Swazi, Bechuana, Seychellori, Mauritian, Rodrigan Islanders, Carribean, Cyprist, Cingalese, Syro-Lebanese, and later, when the fighting was over, a Yugo-Slav detachment, and last but no means least, six Italian groupings, which were in fact miniature Divisions.

Now, Gentlemen, there indeed is a representative number of the United Nations.

When the story of this war is told, one thing will stand out, I think. That is the high state of perfection which was achieved in cooperation between all the three fighting services of the combined nations. It proved not only a battle winning, but a war winning factor.

This blueprint for victory which we learned on the battlefields of Europe must not be forgotten or thrown aside in peace, or we will do so at our peril. In the present and uneasy state the world is going through today, cooperation is more than ever vital. I believe that it is the one thing which can save peace and safeguard our security.

Now, this frightful struggle from which we have emerged and from which we have, with God's blessing, emerged successfully, has shown us one thing. It has shown us who our friends are and that friendship must not only be maintained but strengthened in the interests of us both.

Owing to your unique geographical position, Canada stands as a bridge between the British Empire and those friends of whom I speak, a bridge which connects the old world with the new.

And here lies the way to a willing partnership of the English speaking peoples which will form a rallying point for all those who wish the free and democratic way of life, for I am convinced that in such a partnership lies the greatest factor for the future peace of the world and for the happiness of our own people.

"THE PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS IN BRITAIN"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR WILLIAM CLARK, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., D.C.L.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, October 10, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club, Ladies and Gentlemen of the radio audience. Since the Empire Club of Canada is affiliated with the Royal Empire Society in London, we have the honour and pleasure of being host to a very distinguished former chairman of that Society:

SIR WILLIAM CLARK, G.C.M.G., K.C.S.I., D.C.L.

Sir William resided among us for six years, when in 1928 he became First High Commissioner in Canada for His Majesties Government of the United Kingdom.

It was during those years that so many Canadians came to know his worth and of his scholarship and of his vast experience in British Empire matters.

Closely associated with men like Lloyd George and Winston Churchill and with the diplomatic and business intercourse of such widely different countries as India, South Africa, Basutoland and several others, our guest has devoted so much of his life to the welfare of the Commonwealth.

Sir William is also a businessman for he is a director of a well known British bank, a great English railway and an old established steamship line.

Educated at Eton School and Cambridge University, Sir William Clark is I know, greatly interested in what I may term "the student body of the Empire" for he is closely associated with London House in London, England, which functions for the benefit of people from all over the Empire doing post-graduate work in Britain, in a manner similar to that of Hart House here in the University of Toronto.

The degree of Doctor of Civil Laws has been bestowed on Sir William by Queens University, Bishops University and the University of Western Ontario. He is also Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem.

You will, I think, agree that with this all-too brief a sketch of Sir William that he is well qualified to discuss with us "the Progress and Prospects in Britain" a subject of much significance for Canada and, I venture to say, the world at large.

Sir William, we welcome you back to Canada and trust that you and your daughter will enjoy the renewal of our acquaintance. Gentlemen—Sir William Clark.

SIR WILLIAM H. CLARK: Mr. President, Members of The Empire Club of Canada: Let me first thank you, Gentlemen, for the very kind welcome you have given me and for your hospitality, and you, Sir, for the all too kind things which you have said about me.

I bring to you the greetings of your fellow Society, the Royal Empire Society in London, and I very much appreciate what your President said just now about London House. London House is a hostel which was initiated before the war for the accommodation of post graduate students from the Dominions who otherwise might find life in London a rather lonely and desolate business. I don't mind mentioning that one of the things I am interested in over here is that of interesting the public generally here in London House, partly because we wish to get as many students from Canada as we can. They are beginning to flow in now. During the war I may say we entertained large numbers of officers and men of all ranks there, and just possibly, it has occurred to us, we might be able to raise some funds for the House in the Dominion. I am not dealing with that this morning.

Well, Gentlemen, looking back after the forty years of my public service to which your President referred in almost embarrassing detail, I consider I have been signally fortunate in the diversity of the continents in which I have been called upon to serve, and I can say, in all sincerity, that I look back on the six years I spent in Canada as among the most significant and the most interesting and the most important, because in those six years I was privileged to take a very modest part in the very beginning of that new concept of Empire, the British Commonwealth of Nations, which has so amply justified itself under the desperate ordeal of war.

Then there was Canada to fall in love with, and all the many friends one made in this friendliest of countries. So you will very readily understand with what enthusiasm I climbed the gangway up the mountainside of the *Acquitania* three weeks ago, starting for Canada again—an enthusiasm just a little dampened by finding when I went on board that I was not, as on my previous occasion, received as a specially honoured guest, but was crowded among those whom the Chairman of the company described at a recent annual meeting, as "civil servants and other substandard passengers".

It is tempting to dilate on my impressions of the Canada of today when returning to her after an interval of twelve momentous years, but there are two good reasons against it. First, I have hardly had time to sort out and classify these impressions after all the glamour and excitement of revisiting old haunts and meeting old friends and, next, you know much more about Canada, her thoughts and aims than I ever can and you would, I am sure, greatly prefer that I should talk to you about Britain and her affairs, where I may have the advantage.

But one thing I hope I may say of Canada, since it is something which perhaps you do not so fully realize for yourselves, something which an outsider is in a better position to appreciate, and that is to emphasize the immense prestige with which Canada has emerged from the war, a prestige won by her achievements alike on the field of battle, in the council chambers of the Allies, and in her great industrial effort, a prestige which has brought her at a leap to a high place among the nations that really matter in the world.

Now, let us turn to Britain, and I hope we too may claim some credit under our great war leader for our part in the desperate dangers of those six years. But the Britain with which I am concerned this morning is the Britain of today. At first sight to the outside observer, despite the passage of the months since hostilities came to an end, Britain still looks more than a little worse for wear. During those six years of conflict her complex industrial capacity was mobilized wholly for the needs of the Forces and for defence. Supplies of goods for civilian consumption were cut to a minimum. No domestic houses were built; no work of redecoration was possible; no renewals or repainting was allowed on railroads, on busses or tramcars. Civilian life ticked over on the absolute minimum of conveniences over and above the essential food supplies which never failed.

I suppose most of us thought rather innocently that with the defeat of our enemies these things would right themselves pretty quickly. But it hasn't worked out like that. Urgent national needs have had to come first, just as they did in the war. The first of these, as in all other countries, has been the building of houses to make good the effect of six years arrears of construction, intensified by the destruction and damage caused in London, and many other great cities by enemy action. Four million houses were damaged and a half million totally destroyed. Then there has been the restoration of our export trade always vitally important to a country dependent for its well-being on huge imports of foodstuffs and raw materials, and now doubly so when we have become a debtor nation. In addtiion we have assumed immense responsibilities for promoting every aspect of progress in the Colonial Empire, and for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the war-stricken countries. All this has meant that for the public at large there has been little margin for making good the wear and tear of war, and wind and weather, and for providing the less urgent consumption goods, so that, as those of you who have visited us will know, our cities and homes have a somewhat drab and melancholy look about them, not so much from the open scars of war, which have a dignity of their own, as for lack of that lick of paint which covers a multitude of sins. And still, after a year of peace, the housewife stands in queues. We are still very strictly rationed in food and clothing, and so on, and as you know very well, have recently added bread to the list; and even where there is no actual rationing, there is certainly no plenty. Chasing one's favourite cigarette is still one of our major occupations. Austerity is still very much the keynote.

I am not going to embark on comparisons and contrasts with other countries, always an unprofitable affair. I will only say that I am very much enjoying my present sojourn in your hospitable land. But you must not think that the people of Britain are letting these things get them down. They are disappointed, no doubt, that the return to normal life is a journey so much longer than they had anticipated; they permit themselves a reasonable ration of our time-honoured practice of grumbling; but they accept the situation with philosophy, except perhaps in the matter of housing which in the fullest sense of the phrase "comes home" all too bitterly to the homeless. And anyhow, whatever else may have failed us, we have one consolation, eminently characteristic of our nation—sport has resumed its ancient heritage; racing, football and county cricket have been or are in full swing; never have such crowds poured into the race courses, cricket and football fields, undeterred by the vagaries of a climate which has been more than usually fantastic in the past few months of what we hopefully call the summer.

Moreover, Britain has embarked upon a high endeavour—the endeavour to establish for her people on an assured footing the two great social and economic freedoms—freedom from the fear of want when through sickness or in the end from the inescapable process of the years the worker loses his earning power; freedom from the fear of enforced idleness, of idleness enforced through no fault of the worker but by lack of demand for his labour. These aims are not peculiar to Great Britain; they are, I know, very much the subject of discussion in Canada between the Provinces and the Federal Government. But at home they have by now quite a long history behind them, dating back indeed some thirty years to the pioneer work of the Liberal Cabinet of 1906, a Ministry if ever there was one, of all the talents, which will go down to history as one of the most brilliant of British governments in modern times—the government which initiated old age pensions and insurance against unemployment and then added to it Mr. Lloyd George's great scheme for insurance against invalidity and for the provision of health services.

Since then successive governments of all political complexions have made their contributions, but the scheme embodied in last session's legislation is on a still broader and more comprehensive scale. It follows largely the line of the Beveridge Report and the plan evolved by the wartime Coalition Government. For this is a non-party matter, such differences as have arisen being upon points of varying importance affecting especially the rights and participation of private enterprise and private charity. The scheme begins to come into operation this month when increased old age pensions will be paid to some 4,000,000 persons at present receiving them on a lower scale, at a cost of the Exchequer of £80,000,000 a year. Family allowances for children after the first child began to be paid in August. In due course when the plan has been brought into full operation, it will provide as one comprehensive whole, sickness benefit, unemployment benefit, retirement pension and, finally, a death grant to cover the last expenses which humanity can incur in this vale of tears.

With a scheme on this scale I think you will agree that Britain is embarking on a social adventure which, if not different in kind from previous plans, is yet so different in degree that in its social and psychological consequences it may well be considered something revolutionary.

Let me in especial draw your attention to one item in it which is significant of the new outlook. The term "old age pension" has disappeared and "retirement pension" has taken its place. The former suggested something in the nature of alms when a man had become incapable of earning through advancing years, and this aspect was accentuated in earlier years by pensions only being payable to those without other means. Retirement pension on the other hand, implies that on reaching the statutory age of 65, a man is entitled to leisure in the evening of his days and, of course, he has himself paid part of the cost in advance; he has contributed through payments every week, the other two contributors being his employer and the state.

Over and above the insurance scheme and complementary to it is the ambitious plan for the national health services. The bill in which this scheme is embodied has not yet passed through all stages of its parliamentary career, but it will become law in a few weeks and then will gradually be brought into operation. The plan aims at nothing less than the provision for all classes of the community of every kind of health service—hospital and specialist services, health centres and general practitioner services, supplementary services, such as midwifery, maternity or even the free provision of spectacles and other appliances together with drugs and medicines—all this financed in part from the premiums of the insurance scheme and the rest provided by the state. The broad objective of it all is that there should be available for everyone, in the first place the services which can prevent or cure disease and then, if disease does come, payments to mitigate its effects.

All this, of course, is going to cost a lot of money, to which must be added by the way, £66,000,000 to compensate the medical profession for the abolition of the sale of practices and, as business men, you may have been wondering where it is all coming from. Well, I am not sure whether I quite know the answer to that one. It is a far cry from my own brief sojourn in the Treasury nearly forty years ago as private secretary to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when the City of London was up in arms because we were adding some £13,000,000 if I remember rightly, to a budget of about £150,000,000, in order to pay for old age pensions and other early ventures in social security. But we have altered all that and I think the answer is that in the first place, by safeguarding the health of a nation you add greatly to its capacity for increasing the national wealth, and next, that social security implies the continuous maintenance of spending power and of consumption. Full employment, to which I am coming in a moment, works in the same way, and it is assumed that it also can be maintained. These things being so, and provided always that there is a corresponding increase in production (that is the crucial sine qua non), the economists tell us that it should be possible not only to finance these vast schemes, but also to reduce taxation below its present levels. That, too, is important to the picture as a whole. The present burden of direct taxation is so severe that there is danger of stifling or at least impairing enterprise.

In the case of unemployment, the economic outlook associated with the name of the late Lord Keynes points to the same prime objective, the objective first and foremost of prevention. And the prevention is of no less vital importance though the injury is moral, instead of physical. Unemployment Insurance can safeguard the unemployed worker against destitution, but it does not touch the spiritual evil. Idleness is usually demoralizing even for those who can afford many distractions, but it is disastrous to men condemned to loaf for weeks on end in street or pub or cinema, feeling that no one wants their labour and gradually losing the capacity to make good if the chance comes. Moreover, the fear of unemployment which affects much larger numbers than those actually unemployed, stimulates ugly passions such as fear of the foreigner, jealousy between men and men and of men against women, in the universal scramble for jobs.

The modern theory, as I understand it, is that full employment can be secured and maintained if a nation makes up its mind to ensure an adequate outlay at all times. This must of necessity be made the responsibility of the state. Put very briefly, the state must plan long term programmes of capital expenditure and direct or encourage similar programmes on the part of private enterprise. This may mean in some years national expenditure in excess of what the state receives in taxation, but Lord Beveridge and those who think with him, urge that that should not be regarded as a deterrent. I imagine that our Government had the possibility of action of this kind in mind in the powers which they have taken for the control, if necessary, of private investment, but for the time being in Britain, there is no need for special action.

One of the most striking contrasts between pre-war and post-war Britain is that whereas between the two wars there was an apparent superfluity of population, one of our difficulties now is shortage of manpower. I say apparent superfluity because after all, there must always be two alternative causes of unemployment—it may sometimes, though perhaps rarely, be caused by an excessive density of population, or it may be caused by shortage of demand for the same population's labour. Today in Britain there is an immense demand for all forms of production, most of it of course financed by the Government—a demand for capital goods, such as houses and buildings of all sorts to make good the destruction and arrears of war, and in connection with ambitious schemes for town planning; capital expenditure for the renewal of railways, roads and harbours, demand for consumption goods of every kind, both at home and overseas. These demands could easily have absorbed the pre-war working population into total employment, but in fact the numbers are now actually available, including both men and women, over and above the Armed and Auxiliary Forces, are smaller than in 1939. If one includes those in the Forces, the total working population is about half a million larger than before the war; but in the Armed Forces today there are one and a half million more than in 1939, and some three-quarters of a million demobilized men are enjoying a well-earned holiday and have not yet taken up employment. Government service too requires some 400,000 more than in 1939. So one way and another, the total number available for industry works out at more than two million below the pre-war figure. Some unemployment no doubt remains, about 376,000 in all, mainly in depressed areas such as South Wales, and the Government are endeavouring to deal with this by introducing new industries into such districts.

However, taking it by and large, I think we may claim that the change-over from war to a peace footing in Great Britain has been brought about with remarkable despatch and success. The Armed and Auxiliary Forces reached their peak in June, 1945 at over 5,000,000 men and women. Demobilization has proceeded smoothly and they have now been brought down to 2,000,000. Moreover, we have been fortunately free from labour strikes, though there have been a certain number of the local type, launched without authority of the unions, and consequently often difficult to deal with. During the war our export trade became an almost negligible quantity; it reached its lowest point in 1943 when its volume fell to less than 30 per cent of that of 1938. By the second quarter of this year it had been brought back to 97 per cent, very nearly to the 1938 level. The current figures include relief and rehabilitation supplies for liberated countries which I suppose are not paid for; nevertheless, that is a remarkable achievement. It has meant, of course, considerable sacrifices for the home consumer who, in ordinary circumstances, might reasonably have expected to get the first cut at the joint, but the Government no doubt felt that in the conditions of today the claims of the export market must be regarded as paramount. On the other hand, in the case of our imports, these same circumstances have operated the other way, preventing recovery to prewar levels. The total volume of imports in fact in the first six months of this year stands only at two-thirds of the pre-war figure. Restriction has been inevitable if we are to pay our way, and that has meant cutting down on all imports except the essential foodstuffs and raw materials. That has been exasperating, I am afraid, to our friends who would wish to be sending us manufactured goods of every kind, many pleasant things which have been, to put it mildly, in short supply in Britain for years; but if it is any consolation to them to know it, it is no less disappointing to the would-be customer at home. But in these matters, as in so much else, austerity for a time must rule our lives.

The time has come to try and sum up. I think one may reasonably feel that, as conditions are today, the barometer for trade and industry and employment in the United Kingdom is set fair, but we do face one or two troublesome questions. The first of those is the problem of coal, the commodity on which the whole structure of British industry depends, for Providence has not been kind about supplying us with other sources of power. Besides in happier times coal was the largest single item in our export list. This again is largely a question of manpower. The total number employed in mining in the United Kingdom has fallen from 873,000 in 1939 to 791,000 in the current year. It was expected that the nationalization of the coal industry would reverse this trend, but these hopes have been disappointed. The truth is that the industry has for long been unpopular; it must take time to change the feeling about it; and there is just this one drawback to the present full employment that since new entrants into the labour market can now freely pick and choose, as is indeed most right and proper, they naturally tend to go into the industries which are thought to afford the more agreeable forms of occupation. On the long view mechanization may prove the solution, but, unfortunately, it is the immediate need that matters.

Another somewhat disturbing factor in relation to export trade is the rising level of costs of production caused largely by increases in wage-scales of practically all classes of labour in mining, in industry and in transport. For the time being the whole world is a seller's market but price will again be important when the immediate demands are satisfied and markets once more become competitive. However, there is no point in looking for trouble, and but for the one black spot of the coal problem, I think we may feel well satisfied with the progress which has been made, especially when we consider the enormous complications involved in the change-over from industries organized wholly for war to the more diversified needs of peace.

That, then, is the picture. I have tried to show you that Britain has not lost her old spirit of adventure; once more she is seeking to open up a new world, a world free from the fear of enforced idleness and unmerited want. Difficulties, perhaps serious difficulties, may well lie ahead if conditions become less favourable; but Canadians, I am sure, will watch with sympathy the progress of an experiment which, if it succeeds, as our authorities confidently believe, will afford a new hope for mankind.

Thank you very much for listening so kindly. It has been a very great pleasure, may I say, to be here.

"SOME EXPERIENCES AS A MEDICAL OFFICER WITH THE ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. JACOB MARKOWITZ, M.B.E., M.B., Ph.D., M.S.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, October 17, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air: Our guest of honor and speaker today is a hometown boy who has acquitted himself with distinction in many fields in his few years since graduation. My first reference is one of congratulation in his having been awarded the M.B.E. for his unselfish and most conspicuous devotion to duty while a prisoner of war of the Japanese, having been captured at Singapore in February, 1942.

Prof. Markowitz was born in Toronto, educated at Jarvis St. Collegiate Institute and the University of Toronto. He received his M.B. at the age of 22 and his Ph.D when only 25. He was appointed Assistant Professor in Physiology Glasgow University 1926-27, and later Professor of Physiology, Georgetown University, Washington. The Doctor is the author of nearly one hundred scientific papers on Metabolism and Surgery, some of them having been written when serving at the Mayo Foundation. He is also National Secretary of the Canadian Authors' Association.

It is my privilege to introduce to you Professor and Dr. Jacob Markowitz, M.B.E., M.B., Ph.D., M.S., who will tell us

"SOME EXPERIENCES AS A MEDICAL OFFICER WITH THE ROYAL ARMY MEDICAL CORPS WHILE A PRISONER OF WAR WITH THE JAPANESE."

DR. JACOB MARKOWITZ: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: You will forgive me if I point out that this war represents the termination of the greatest and most terrible religious war in all history. The only one I can compare it with is the Thirty Years War in Germany about the year 1600. It is significant that that religious war also occurred in Germany. When it was finished half of the people in that country were dead. However, the religious points involved in this war can not in all fairness be stated to belong in their entirety to the Christian, or for that matter, to any other religion. These tenets are three in number.

First, we fought this war to establish the sanctity of the human personality. Every human being, no matter how humble, has an inalienable right to his life, to his dignity, and to his right of appearing equal before the law, as we believe he is equal before God, to the richest man in the country. We do not believe that any human being can be sterilized against his will. We do not believe that the privacy of his home can be violated without due process of law, which at all times must be regarded as a grave matter. This principle is a Christian principle.

The second point for which we fought this war is our right of free speech. This is not a Christian principle and indeed has often been combated by the various branches of the Church. The right of a man to have his say openly, subject to the laws of libel, subject to the law against creating a public disturbance, is a peculiarly British institution. How it came about that this wonderful thing should have originated from a funny cold little island I do not know. John Stuart Mill made the statement in his essay on Liberty, that if 999 men believed one thing, and one man disagreed with them, they had no more moral right to restrict his utterance on the subject than he had to prevent them having their say. This principle of free speech in Canada is far more important than the fact that there are a few scatter-brained Communists in the country: let them have their say.

The third point over which this war was fought is our right to govern ourselves. We British maintain that this business of government is no more complicated than the management of a club, a church or a village. Stripped of its verbiage, running the country is similar to running any other institution which involves a number of people, and we insist on doing it ourselves or delegating someone who is responsible to us to do it for us.

These principles are peculiarly British and they stem from no other part of the world. When the American Colonists revolted against the British Crown they behaved in the best British tradition, and I should like to point this out to our American listeners of the air. The Americans had no greater defendants in their own country than William Pitt and Edmund Burke, who fulminated in the British House of Commons against our iniquity in shooting down fellow-Englishmen. The tradition of liberty in America is still a British tradition.

It is appropriate to mention with pride before the Empire Club of Canada that in the last three hundred years we British have done *more* for the human race than the rest of the world put together. I don't know why. I am a physiologist and not a philosopher. It is part of my creed to maintain that human beings and dogs have much in common; consequently I am not able to explain why a person living in Britain should be so different from one living in Romania or Turkey. Perhaps we British have become great because we were spared the horrors of invasion for a thousand years, so that the human personality has been able to flourish there. Some of my friends believe in the British Israelite movement; and if I were sufficiently in sympathy with them, I would say that their claims fit the story perfectly because the British people are so utterly different from any other people in the world. If it hadn't been for them, just think what a sorry mess the world would be in today! It is an extraordinary thing to contemplate that if it had not been for four or five European countries, namely the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, there would be no such thing as modern civilization and we would be living in the culture implanted by Egypt three thousand years ago, the culture of ancient China and Peru; and of these four countries that I have mentioned by far the sublimest has been the British contribution.

It was my great privilege to be associated with the British Army in the capacity of a Medical Officer when I was finally captured in Singapore. Prior to that I had been Surgical Officer with No. 5 C.C.S. just behind the front lines all during the Japanese invasion of Malaya. We would do our stuff for three days or so during which we were bombed, not directly, but because we were always close to the post office and the railway station we were continuously under fire. When it got so bad that we could not work we would be ordered back fifty miles or so. For the benefit of Dr. Gallie, I might state that an Indian C.C.S. has a heavy section and a light section. The heavy section is equipped somewhat like a general hospital; the light section resembles in equipment a field ambulance. Since it takes about three days to set up a heavy section, we used our light equipment. We operated on stretchers, for example, and didn't do too badly.

The British Army is of course the greatest retreating army in the world. We have done far more retreating than advancing. I need only mention the retreat of Sir John Moore at Corunna; then there is the campaign of Arthur Wellesley in Portugal, and of course our magnificent evacuation from Dunkirk. So as we retreated through Malaya, we didn't feel too down-hearted; we knew that we were overwhelmed in point of numbers, preparedness, strategy and aircraft.

However, there came a time when the incredible happened. The British Army suffered the biggest military reverse in its history: as one Tommy put it, we finally ran out of earth and had to surrender. It looked as if the end of the world had arrived. How could we then know that this was inevitable, that all this talk about Singapore being impregnable was so much talk to deter the Japanese from doing the suicidal thing that they finally did.

On the Sunday following our surrender we all went to church, as if an Order had been published to that effect. We British are like that. The Padre looked very melancholy, and in his sermon asked the question how Divine Providence could permit us to fall into the hands of the Japanese? Divine Providence knew more about it than we did. I don't recall that he answered the question very successfully.

We were abominably treated. For the first ten days after our capture we received no food from the Japanese whatever. Meanwhile they commandeered all supplies of tinned food. We got very hungry. Most of us had a tin or two of bully beef, in addition to our iron rations. After about ten days we asked the Japanese guards if it was their intention to starve us to death, but they gave no answer; perhaps they didn't know. Then rations of rice appeared, ten ounces of rice a day, about a thousand calories. This continued for roughly six months. The men developed beri-beri and other nutritional disturbances in droves. We were given the explanation that because we dared to take up arms against the divine emperor we would be punished by partial starvation for six months. You know it was a great spiritual experience. Now that it is all over I would not have missed it for worlds. Here we were precipitated back at least three thousand years into a civilization described in the Old Testament. We didn't even have a light. We had to do everything by hand, and we were desperately poor. Would you be amused if I told you that we grew cotton and spun it? We had to keep a perpetual fire going, as otherwise there would be no means of cooking our miserable ration of rice. We suddenly understood how important were the Vestal Virgins in Rome whose job of course it was to keep the sacred fire going all the time. Our fire did go out once I think and we did without cooked food until somebody mysteriously produced a match.

Six months after the surrender the Japanese affably told us that our period of punishment was over and that we would now be transferred to Siam, a primary food producing country where our lot would be better. That was always the Japanese technique. Whenever they wished to punish us they promised us an amelioration of our lot: that made the subsequent disillusionment much harder to bear. Our destination was about twelve hundred miles from Singapore. We were bundled into tiny box cars, which were somewhat smaller than the French cars for forty men or eight horses. We could not lie down, we got tired of standing up, and this nightmare journey lasted for five days and four nights.

We arrived at our destination bruised physically and numb mentally. We arrived into a flooded country at the height of the Monsoon season, with no shelter. We were drenched by rain during the night, we were scorched by the sun in the daytime. And this was our new home. This was the improvement that had been promised us.

We were told that it was our duty to build a railway from Bangkok to Rangoon. It was of course in defiance of the Geneva Convention, but our captors had never heard of this. It was an impossible, a mad undertaking, one that had been refused by a British construction company as an impossible venture years ago. The soldiers developed malaria and dysentery by the thousand, and it soon appeared that there would be no soldiers left. In the meantime coolies from Malaya had been seduced up country by the promise of good wages. Bad as we thought was our neglect, theirs was even more pitiable. When the railway was finally constructed—for the Japanese, like ourselves, are a determined race—we computed that for every rail laid a British Tommy gave his life, and for every wooden tie, or sleeper as the English call it, a coolie died. When the Medical Officers protested, they were of course smacked about vigorously and were told that if a British soldier broke one stone before he died, it would be in the service of the emperor, and it would be counted to him as virtue.

It became evident that our job as Medical Officers was to patch up these broken wrecks so that they could do their work more efficiently in the construction of this railway. We quickly learned that a prisoner-of-war of the Japanese becomes a Japanese national, subject to Japanese military and civil law. He is expected to do his duty by the Emperor and any dereliction in this is most reprehensible. If he attempts to escape he is regarded as a deserter and, like a Japanese, is shot. I was able to secrete the following document which was read out to us at our camp. It is an example of English as she is Japped by a second-rate interpreter.

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO P. O. W. ON MY ASSUMING THE COMMAND

> I have the pleasure to lead you on the charge of last stretch of Railway Construction Wardom with the appointment of present post.
>
> In examination of various reports, as well as to the result of my partial Camp inspection of the present conditions, am pleased to find that you are, in general, keeping discipline and working diligently. At the same time, regret to find seriousness in health matter.
>
> It is evident that there are various causes inevitable for this end, but to my opinion, due mainly to the fact for absence of firm belief of Japanese. "Health follows will" and "Ceases only when enemy is completely annihilated."
>
> Those who fail to reach objective in charge, by lack of health or spirit, is considered in Japanese Army as most shameful deed: "Devotion till death" is good, yet still we have the spirit, "Devotion to Imperial cause even to the 7th turn of life in incarnation," the spirit which, cannot become void by death.
>
> You are in the act of charge in colleague with charge to the last stage of this work with good spirit by taking good care of your own health. Besides, you are to remember that your welfare is guaranteed only by obedience to the order of the Imperial Japanese Army.
>
> Imperial Japanese Army, will not be unfair to those who are honest and obey them, but protect them. You are to understand this fundamental

Japanese spirit, and carry out the task given you, with perfect ease of mind, under protection of I. J. A.

Given in Kanchanburi, June 26, 43.
Col. Sijuo Nakamura.
Commander of P. O. W. Camp in Thailand.

DR. MARKOWITZ continued: This is a fantastic document. Here was a camp of seven thousand sick, most of whom were bed-ridden. About twenty deaths a day occurred, and we were told that "health follows will", and that it was a most shameful thing to be sick.

I do not wish to expatiate on the cruelties practised on us. They were real enough, and in fact were exactly like the atrocity stories so generally believed to be fictitious and offered to a gullible public to incite them to hate their foes. It is the British way to be generous to a beaten foe; and at this period I can not help expressing my admiration of these Japanese—their devotion to duty, their superb bravery, their cleanliness, their ability to work harmoniously, and their industry. It is somehow alien to the Eastern mind to practice this totally European thing called chivalry, and in spite of all their twaddle about "Bushido" they do not understand that a prisoner-of-war who is helpless must not be kicked around, must not be outraged, and must be treated generously in consequence.

One of the most trying things of our captivity was the almost complete absence of reliable news, except here and there where a radio could be secretly made and kept operating. A certain Major Smith, an engineer, walked into the Medical Officers' Mess one day and he said, "You know we have got a canary but it can't whistle without food. I have been trying to get bird seed for this canary for a long time, but without success." So I waved five local dollars in the air (equivalent to twenty cents in Canadian money, and I say, "If you offer this to one of your thugs, I am sure that some bird seed will be stolen." That afternoon an enterprising Tommy stole a battery from a parked lorry, and the canary began to chirp.

This was about the time when Admiral Darland came over to our side, and we received the news joyfully. In spite of all the promises of decoration that Major Smith could make, it was not until he offered five dollars that a battery was produced. This is something for Socialists to ponder over: to me that has demonstrated forever the superiority of capitalism over socialism. By the way, the radio was discovered and Major Smith and his associates were taken into captivity and were brutally tortured in an effort to make them confess that this was a broadcasting unit.

In another camp the Royal Corps of Signals, a most efficient body, constructed a workable radio set from one tube, some bits of paper, and a pair of ear phones. This was powered by a flashlight battery. It was concealed in the false bottom of an Army water bottle. The Japanese never did find it, but they looked awfully hard. Most units, however, did not have a wireless and we found the lack of news exasperating. It resulted in an incredible crop of rumours which masqueraded as authentic news. A psychologist would have had an interesting time studying these. The statement that the war was over in Europe and that Germany had capitulated cropped up every two months, and would be believed until a slip of paper with some authentic news would be secreted into the camp. We concluded that the news of Germany's capitulation always originated in the following way: a friendly native would shout over the fence that Germany was being badly bombed. A Tommy would repeat this and add that he didn't see how she could stand it much longer. This would be repeated as the statement that the Germans were not able to stand the bombing much longer. The story then would progress serially as, that Germany was tottering; that her collapse was imminent. A Tommy would say that the last news he had heard was that Germany was collapsing and that by this time she had probably capitulated; and so on. Those of us who heard about the

Russian advance had the Russians in Berlin a year before they reached Berlin.

It became evident to us that without the corrective feature of the written word, it was impossible for a human being to repeat accurately what he had heard: he always colored it with an inference which generally took the direction of what might be called "wishful thinking." After all, this conclusion is not remarkable. It explains how it is that legends develop an accretion of myth and supernatural detail, even when the original story is probably quite true. This incidentally explains much of the Biblical narrative, which I am sure is fundamentally accurate but which a succession of pious narrators have unconsciously altered.

As I said, we doctors were there to patch up the broken wrecks of humanity. Of course we had no equipment. It had all been taken by the Japanese Army. However, we were able, by sending out a petition among the troops to procure a dozen well worn forceps, a few hypodermic needles and some stethoscope tubing. There was always plenty of chloride of lime for a disinfectant. It became a surprisingly simple thing to improvise an operating room and to do transfusions. I am sure that by means of transfusions we saved thouands of lives. Every physician knows that if you take a stick and stir blood as it is being collected from a vein, the material that makes it clot collects on the stick and the blood stays fluid indefinitely. So, instead of using sodium citrate, the chemical normally used in transfusion work to prevent clotting, we did nearly four thousand transfusions using this "defibrinated" blood. There were no deaths and very few reactions. We would take a big husky Australian and give his blood to some poor fellow whose life was ebbing away because of dysentery or malaria, and later when he got better, we would give his blood perhaps to the big fellow who by this time might be down.

In addition we had a large number of men who had to have their legs amputated because they were going crazy with pain from tropical ulcers, or were suffering from severe infections of their shin bone. Their illness was of course entirely due to neglect and normally would not occur. By means of novocaine, which we were able to purchase in the black market, our doctors in one camp alone did a most charitable work removing legs from 115 people, of whom over half were alive at the end of the war. I recently received a photograph of the Chungkai Amputation Group, as they called themselves, in Rangoon, where they were flown on our release. One of these fellows was an Australian who, following his spinal anaesthetic, stopped breathing. This is a very distressing episode for the doctor in charge. The doctor of course is a magician. He puts people to sleep and he wakes them up at will. He looks at funny things through a microscope. When he claps a stethoscope over his ears, he looks as mysterious as any savage medicine man with horns on his head. Well, here was a fellow who stopped breathing and appeared to be dying, and the orderlies in the operating room demanded magic. You should know that artificial respiration, according to the usual technique, does not work in spinal anaesthesia, because the chest is collapsed, so there is no use compressing it to get air in and out of the chest; it just doesn't work. So in a moment of desperation a rubber tube was put into the man's mouth and we blew air into it, very much like Elijah the Prophet. You remember how the widow came to Elijah and asked for help for her son. Elijah breathed into him face to face, and the child recovered. I have often done this very thing during the Malayan campaign. That story of Elijah is too circumstantial just to be a yarn. At any rate, when we blew air into this man's lungs, we could see the color return to his face. After about twenty minutes, he spat the tube out of his mouth, and said, "I am glad you guys don't eat onions; I don't like onions." These Australians are a hardy race.

I want to tell you a story about the intrepid spirit of an Englishman. You know in all the three-and-a-half years of my captivity I laughed more heartily than in any three-and-a-half years of my life. It was our sense of humour that kept us alive. The Japanese told us that a pig was dying outside the compound and they would be glad to sell it to us, because we always had money, for some mysterious reason. Well, pig is pig even if it's dying. We bought it, and in order to tell the troops that there was pork available, the head was disarticulated and put on the table of our improvised canteen, so anyone who went by would see it and say, "Well, there must be pork."

Well, a Japanese Sergeant-Major strutting through the camp and waiting to be saluted, noticed out of the corner of his eyes that a British captain was in the vicinity, and that he did not salute him perhaps because he hoped he was not seen. So he came up to the British captain, who saluted him somewhat lamely. The following performance took place:

"You English officer-ka?"

"Yes", was the answer. (smack)

"You proud-ka?" (no answer)

"Answer, you proud-ka?"

"Not proud." (smack)

"You proud-ka?"

"Yes, I proud."

"Oh, you proud!" (smack, smack)

Then he walked away in accordance with the Geneva Convention.

How did an Englishman handle a thing like that? I think like an American would handle it. He saw the disarticulated head of the pig and walked up to it, and said,

"You English officer, eh?" (smack)

"You proud, eh?" (smack)

"Oh, you not proud, eh?" (smack)

"English shoko (officer) no goodena." (smack, smack)

A Korean sentry had stalked up behind the officer's back to see what all the excitement was about, and do you know what he did? He walked away very much ashamed. That was the most marvellous thing I saw. That is the way an Englishman behaves when he is in trouble.

I don't know how much time we have got, but you should know that we had quite an epidemic of cholera. This is a ghastly disease. Whole villages in India have lost fifty per cent. of their population in a week through cholera. In this disease the patient loses a great deal of fluid because of painless diarrhoea. He shrivels up like a mummy; his pulse becomes feeble; his voice becomes a whisper. Sometimes he gets painful muscular cramps, and he passes away in a coma. All this is due entirely to the fact that he has become dried out from the loss of fluid, like a frog that loses its way and becomes locked in one of our rooms. Now the proper treatment is to replace this fluid, which must be a weak solution of salt water—pure water of course, otherwise it is a bad business. You will be interested to hear how the Medical Officers encountered this disease in most camps. One Medical Officer made an intravenous needle by drilling a bamboo thorn, by means of which he infused a salt solution that he made by adding table salt to filtered well water. This caused reactions but it saved lives. In areas where it rained a lot, rain water was regarded as perfectly good distilled water, and when salt was added to it, it was just as good as water obtained in a hospital.

In my particular camp we heard about cholera before it actually struck us, so we got two discarded four-gallon petrol drums, and out of these we managed to make a still. Thus we were prepared to make a supply of salt water when cholera finally appeared among us. When the cholera left us the still came in most handy for the making of gin, which gladdeneth the heart of man. But that is another story.

One of the saddest features of our captivity was the premature aging of thousands of men. Let no one tell you that old age does not involve a nutritional factor. I know that it does. A young man of twenty-five would look forty-five by the time three years had elapsed. A dashing Colonel of fifty-two after three years would be a broken, decrepit old soldier, one who obviously would be unable to continue his career in the Army. I remember the classical scolars quoting:

"Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume,
labuntur anni, nec pietas moram
rugis et instanti senectae
adferet, indomitaeque morti . . ."

"The moving finger writes, and
having writ, moves on" . . .

Horace said it much better.

You will be interested to hear that there were some Americans in our group towards the end. They were Regulars in the American Navy, and we kidded them a great deal, of course. They used to say to us: "Yours is a decadent and effete civilization." I wish we had known then about radar and penicillin. It might have been quite a good talking point. Instead one British Tommy said, "Now look here, old fellow, you know the story of Noah, you know, the Bible chappie. He was a farmer you know; remember the vineyard? Well, you know Noah carried a lot of animals with him in the Ark, and it rained interminably. He did not want to lose the manure that accumulated, so he kept it on deck. But there came a time when he could not stand it any more, and he threw it overboard, and you know that stuff was not discovered until 1942." We heard nothing more about our decadent and effete civilization after that.

Now I think I am getting near the end of my time. It has been my privilege to address the Empire Club of Canada. I have come home again. I think the people of the United Kingdom are the very salt of the very earth, and I think we in Canada would be very wise to follow their lead. Just think what is happening to the meat situation across the line! Can you imagine that in the United Kingdom? There, the worst possible thing has already happened—they have a Labor Government!!! There is no shooting, and if it happens to be a mistake, it can be rectified. It is true the new government is making a hash of the Palestinian situation. Nevertheless we in this country would be well advised to hitch our wagon to their star, because I think that star will ascend again and it will be brighter than ever.

We have won this war handsomely, and I don't think we are going to fritter it away.

I want to close with a quotation from Rupert Brooke

> "Honour has come like a king to the earth,
> And paid his subjects with a royal wage,
> And nobleness walks in our ways again,
> And we have come into our heritage."

"DO WE FACE IDEOLOGICAL CONQUEST"

AN ADDRESS BY

STUART ARMOUR

Chairman: The President, Mr. Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, October 24, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air, today—as last week—we welcome as our guest of honour a home town boy. The family name "Armour" has been long and favourably known in this city and in this country. When we find ourselves at war, we can always count on an Armour to acquit himself with distinction. Our guest today is no exception. He served in World War I from 1914 to 1919. In civilian life he has been a journalist and author of note, presently connected with Prof. Gilbert Jackson and associates. He is the author of a recent brilliant article appearing in one of our weeklies on the Russian ideology which article has been the subject of much favourable comment. This background, gentlemen, enables him to write and to talk so effectively and so convincingly. It is my pleasure to turn the microphone over to Major Stuart Armour D.S.O., Croix de Guerre, whose topic is—"Do We Face Ideological Conquest"? Major Armour.

STUART ARMOUR: Gentlemen of The Empire Club: There is a great, and often very bitter, debate going on around the world today. It is perhaps the most important debate in which mankind has ever engaged; since it has for its subject the sort of world which will emerge from the terrible wreckage of the second world war within a third of a century.

Famous men and women are still engaged in this debate in London and Washington and Paris and Moscow and Chungking. Here in Toronto, as in Winnipeg and in Montreal, Mr. Summer Welles has just added his influential voice to those of such figures as Truman, Molotov, Attlee, Bevin, Eden and Churchill. Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann, and a host of lesser commentators, all have their say.

Who will win this debate no man yet knows. But that the democracies shall emerge as victors is of the most vital importance to you and to me; and to our children and their descendants.

It might well be asked why, as a mere layman, I should seek to take part in so great a controversy. My only excuse for doing so is that we Canadians, despite having achieved a new status as a result of our colossal effort during the late war, appear still to think in terms of a world which ceased to exist at the outbreak of World War II on September 3rd, 1939.

Mr. Sumner Welles spoke on world affairs in Toronto on Monday night of this week at the invitation of the John W. Dafoe Foundation. In the course of his very important address, Mr. Welles said that it was "a dangerous delusion" to think that Democracy and Communism cannot exist simultaneously in the same world. He added, however, that if the world was to live half Communist and half free, the advocates of Communism must be "willing to confine their own beliefs within their own sovereign jurisdiction".

With the sentiments expressed by Mr. Welles in this fashion, I, in common with all men of goodwill, most heartily agree. In fact, I think it safe to say that no responsible person in the democracies has any desire to interfere with what the Soviets may do in Russia. But in the same way, the majority of those in the democracies are most anxious to be left to the enjoyment of their own way of life.

However, whether we are to have peace, or a new world war, is not a question which is likely to be settled in Toronto. It is most important to remember, in fact, that the future peace of the world may now be said to depend not on what democratic statesmen, however eminent, may *say* or *think*; but on what Stalin, Molotov, Vishinsky and the Moscow Politburo may *do*.

In this connection, it must reluctantly, and with great regret, be recorded that there still continue, what Senator Arthur Vandenberg, on his recent return from the Paris Peace Conference, described as the "campaigns of reckless vilification which flow constantly from Moscow". Unfortunately, as far as one is able to observe, the Communists appear to regard peace as a very sturdy plant indeed, since Communist propaganda and intrigue seem to be going on unabated throughout the world. There is ample evidence from many sources to support that statement, including the disclosures of Communist infiltration in Canada, supplied by the investigation of our Royal Commission on Espionage.

But in any event, Mr. Welles, in his Toronto speech, called for "a positive policy" on the part of the democracies toward Russia. If we Canadians are to play a part in the evolution of such a policy, I take it that we should most carefully examine our position in the world, lest we remain blind to the dangers which now confront us; or which may develope in future.

While it is difficult for Canadians, who have always dwelt secure under the joint protection of Britain and the United States, to imagine Canada falling a victim to Communism, it must be remembered that we live in a changed and changing world. Strange as it may seem, what has happened elsewhere might happen here.

The accident of geography has placed Canada in the very centre of the world struggle which seems to be developing between the Russian and Anglo-Saxon ways of life.

Communism is undeniably on the move; with the overthrow of capitalism as its oft-declared objective. Canada stands as a land bridge between Russia and the United States, and is perhaps still the keystone of the British Commonwealth. Remember, then, that Canada today is economically very vulnerable vis-à-vis Russia. Hence it is that one stops to ask in all seriousness: Do we indeed stand in danger of ideological conquest?

What, in other words, are the prospects of Canada finding herself a satellite of Russia; or living within the Russian orbit? For that, of course, is what I mean when I talk about ideological conquest.

My purpose today is not to try to provide a definite answer to the question (for only Moscow can do that), but rather to explore with you some of the implications arising out of it.

The New York Times said recently, in an obviously inspired story from its Ottawa correspondent, that our military men deplore the suggestion that Canada is to be the principal battle ground of World War III. Moreover, these unnamed warriors are quoted as declaring that "an invasion of this continent, *except in the event of flagrant and extensive treachery from within,* is not possible at present".

You will observe the reservation "except in the event of treachery from within", which the statement contains. In the light of the disclosures of our Royal Commission on Espionage that reservation seems to me an exceedingly important one, especially in relation to what I have to say today.

This whole statement creates, in fact, the suspicion that our military authorities may be falling into the error of trying to visualise World War III in terms of World War II; just as in 1939 so many of them still appeared to think in terms of 1914-1918.

The third world war, whose preliminary moves may already be discernible, promises, if it comes, to be unlike any other war. Next time the clash will be to a greater degree than ever before a struggle between rival ideologies; and psychological factors will thus inevitably bulk large. In carrying on psychological or ideological warfare, such weapons as envy, hatred and malice will be used without stint with the object of causing the greatest possible economic, social and political disintegration.

In this type of warfare no weapon is too mean; and no tactics are too dirty. Drive a wedge between old allies; sow suspicion between classes; make existing authority look ridiculous; create dissension everywhere. Those are among the means by which such wars are won; and it cannot, I think, be denied that they are even now being employed to bring about the downfall of our system, to ensure the elimination of the middle class throughout the world so that ruthless dictators can control an otherwise leaderless proletariate.

In trying to visualise the possible character of a third world war, it is well to bear in mind that Russia has two armies. The one is the great military machine which did so much to smash Germany. The other, a most sinister army having a revolutionary creed as the basic for its strategy and tactics; an army which goes into action under no banners; and which uses no brass bands in its relentless drive for recruits, and for results.

The first of these armies has just seen its 1947 budget cut by ten billion dollars. It may be that this is the best evidence yet produced that Moscow realises the essentially different character of the next war. On the other hand, it may be an indication that Churchill was right when he said at Fulton, Missouri last winter, that Russia did not want war, but only the fruits of war.

Perhaps the Kremlin believes that intensified ideological warfare, using economic and psychological weapons, can bring about the downfall of capitalism without the need for throwing great armies into the field. All these are suppositions, and they must, of course, remain in the realm of speculation. For the moment at least, they are interesting conjectures and nothing else.

Of one thing we may be sure, however, and that is that the second Russian army of which I have spoken; the subversive, underground army, which uses perfidy as one of the most potent of its weapons; and which wins its victories through the creation of class bitterness and social unrest, has all the funds it needs.

Of course, both of these two Russian armies work together for the achievement of the World Revolution. The fact, therefore, that one has more money to spend than the other in some given year is not particularly significant. Social unrest in Russia may make it expedient to spend less next year directly on the military forces and more on social services and scientific research; and, indeed, an extra sum of $566,000,000 has been set aside by Russia in its 1947 budget for scientific research. But, after all, the purpose of this vast increase in research expenditure has been declared by Moscow to be the furthering of the "growth of the economic and military might of the Soviet Union". Authorities suspect that much of it will go to the development of an atomic bomb, but in any event, it is clearly at least quasi-military in character.

As a matter of fact, a good deal has been made lately in North American newspapers about the discontent of the Russian people. At the same time, we have been told that Stalin's influence is now less than it once was, because Molotov and Vishinsky have found in that famous Man of Steel, signs of growing softness and sweet reason.

But if the Soviet pursuit of the overthrow of capitalism, and the elimination of the middle class, is to become more ruthless than ever because of this change in Stalin, then domestic unrest in Russia may well be a new danger signal for us. Remember that war has long been a favourite device for taking the minds of discontented people off their grievances.

As I have already said, our geographical position makes it certain that we cannot remain neutral in any clash between Russia and the West. Surely then, it behooves the citizens of Canada to try to visualise the economic, political and military situations with which their country may in future be confronted.

While another shooting war may not be near at hand; while it may even be far in the future; ever since the Russian Revolution of 1917 the world has been engaged in ideological warfare, with Communism on one side, and the Anglo-Saxon democracies on the other. For long periods that warfare was on such a small scale as to attract little attention. But while we may have ignored it, the Communists have never done so.

We have proof in our Royal Commission Report that the opening phase of the ideological assualt upon Canada began some years ago, and that even before VE Day, the Communists were trying to subvert the servants of the Canadian people. More recent events especially in the realm of disputes between capital and labour, testify that this ideological assault upon us is becoming ever more intense.

It should never be forgotten that this ideological warfare which is even now taking place within our own boundaries, is warfare of the most ruthless character. It is carried on by fanatical and ruthless men and women; with no weapons or strategems outlawed by any feelings of chivalry or good sportsmanship. One need only read the weekly and monthly Communist press of Canada to realise that important fact.

Nor should we be under any misapprehension as to the objective of this undercover offensive. It is nothing short of the total elimination of the middle class—an objective laid down quite explicitly, and with great emphasis, as early as 1848 in the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. It is well to remember, then, that you and I are included in that middle class; and that our whole existing capitalist system, and its concomitant democracy, are products of middle-class effort and self-sacrifice.

While we are on the subject of the Communist Manifesto, it might be interesting to digress for a moment to consider the other principal objectives it lays down. These are the abolition of private property; abolition of the right of inheritance; centralisation of credit in the hands of the state; centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state; extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state. Then, lest you feel that the Communist objectives of 1848 do not differ greatly from those toward which Canada has striven in 1946, let me read the closing words of the world-shaking document:

> "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can

> be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win."

Briefly, the Communist Manifesto further says that Communism supports every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things. It represents the enemy in every case to be the private ownership of property. Only by eliminating the private ownership of property can the ends of Communism be attained, so says the Communist Manifesto.

Some of those best informed in such matters go so far as to see in the present trend of events in Canada a menace not only to our future, but to the future of the whole Anglo-Saxon world. Indeed, they go so far as to think that our spy ring disclosures face Canada with a situation, which if not adequately dealt with, may well constitute a grave danger to all of Western civilization. They think, in other words, that we are in a very real sense the soft under-belly of democracy.

Their view, based primarily on the fact of geography, is that if the people of Canada could be won over to an ideology out of step with that of the other democracies; or that if our territories were to be overrun by those embracing such an ideology, the whole safety of the Anglo-Saxon world would be brought into peril.

Of course, only by the downfall of Britain as a wide-scale imperial power, and by the destruction of capitalism in the United States, can the Communists hope to achieve the eventual goal of a world order under the control of Moscow.

The withdrawal of Britain from India and Egypt, coupled with her inability to keep Russia out of the Atlantic (nor very far away from the Adriatic and the Mediterranean); all indicate the extent of Communism's progress toward achievement of the first of those twin objectives. In the light of its progress toward one objective, is it not logical to suppose that it may be encouraged to look toward the second? Remember that there still remains before the greedy eyes of Communism that most glittering of all prizes for the world revolutionary—the overthrow of capitalism in the United States. If this could be accomplished, Russia could indeed look forward to having the world as her oyster.

Let us suppose, then, that the Communists, encouraged by the success of their dynamic and ruthless policy, now see before them the possibility of achieving the overthrow of capitalism in the United States. Then let us try to imagine ourselves in the position of the Moscow dictatorship, in the face of a decision to push toward that goal. Let's see how the Muscovite mind would in all probability work.

Our weapons would, of course, be both economic and military. As a start, we should probably tell our people (the Russians) that dreams of a plenitude of consumer goods must give way before the "world plot" against us; that all efforts must therefore be on the production of capital goods. That is precisely what the Russians have already been told in a whole series of speeches by Stalin and other Russian leaders. It is also the very core and essence of the current Russian Five-Year Plan.

At the same time, we, as Russians, would start looking for, or even creating, soft spots in Anglo-Saxon defenses. Now Canada constitutes the weakly-held outer-works which form part of the only remaining citadel of capitalism in this world. This fact means that, willy-nilly, we stand together with the United States, as an obstacle to the ambitions of Communism. It is something to remember, then, that the air age has made Russia a closer neighbour to vast areas of our country than is the United States.

Canada would thus be sure to attract our early attention; for Canada is a country peculiarly dependent for prosperity on world trade; and without prosperity, social unrest would soon create here just such a situation as the Communists know so well how to exploit.

Unfortunately for us Canadians, but not for the Russians, Canada is also a country demonstrably without inherent unity; and, moreover, we are a country in which a small population controls a territory vast in size and rich in resources, both actual and potential. Could any better soft spot suggest itself to us if we were Russians?

That it has already so suggested itself to Moscow can, perhaps, be deduced from the actions of Colonel Zabotin and his collaborators in the spy ring exposed by our Royal Commissioners. Futhermore, the evidence before the Commission shows that, even in times of national emergency, and while we were enjoying our greatest prosperity, there were Canadians most eager to help in establishing Russian Communism here.

Our situation, in fact, lends itself so well to economic attack by Communism that possibly no shot need ever be fired to bring about our downfall.

The idea of conquering us without the firing of a shot may be heretical to our naval, military and air force authorities. But even while we continue intently to watch our sea coasts and our Arctic frontiers, the Communists may cause such economic hardship in Canada, and its resulting social and political confusion as to make the ideological conquest of Canada well within the bounds of possibility.

Since I have indicated that both political and military situations tend to develop from the state of our economy, let us look briefly at the sort of world economic situation which Russia might conceivably develop at Canada's expense.

Here the important fact to be borne in mind is that of our enormous dependence on external trade. Canada is one of the least self-sufficient countries in the world (still a matter of surprise to many Canadians brought up on the myth of our "limitless resources") Hence we must be both exporters and importers on a very large scale.

Our economic vulnerability vis-à-vis Russia arises out of the fact that we raise, and the Muscovites raise or control, great sources of the same sort of raw materials. We are great wheat raisers; so are Russia and her satellite Hungary. We are great producers of forest products. But Russia has the world's greatest forest resources; and her relations with Finland, and other timber producing areas of Europe, give her control of vast new quantities of forest products. We have been the world's greatest exporters of non-ferrous metals. Here again Russia may be in a new position to challenge our supremacy.

What, then, are Russia's present intentions toward the world economy? Can she be persuaded to join with other countries in an effort to up-build world trade on the scale necessary to avoid International disaster? Or will she deliberately invite economic chaos on a world scale in order to further the spread of Communism?

These are questions of vital interest to all the world. But there is another question; a question which our vast dependence on export trade, makes equally important to every man, woman and child in Canada. It is: Will Communism, in pursuit of its aims, use its new sources of raw materials to break world markets in the commodities we must sell abroad at profitable prices if we are to avoid depression?

Unfortunately, we must depend upon the Kremlin for the answers to all the questions I have raised; and the Kremlin either preserves a stony and mysterious silence, or indulges in what sounds, at least, very much like double talk.

With our relatively high costs of production, arising in part from our post-war wage structure, and in part from our newly enacted and most expensive programme of social legislation, we are now peculiarly at the mercy of any country which can break world prices in the commodities which form the bulk of our export trade. In the old days we always had in Britain a certain market for our primary products—provided that we were prepared to accept the British price. Today Britain is a debtor nation on an enormous scale, sore beset by her own economic problems.

While the scale of our exports is very great, their range is comparatively narrow. Thus we send out into the world mainly our surplus of cereals, forest products and non-ferrous metals, and use the profits from these exports, not only to keep many of our own factories busy, but also to pay for a great variety of imports without which we could not support here the world's second highest standard of living.

The large volume of our imports has been matched by their great diversity. Great Canadian industries are almost wholly dependent upon outside raw materials for their continuance. Indeed, our whole industrial machine would soon come to a stop without very large-scale imports of coal, petroleum, machine tools, and raw cotton, to name only some of the most important.

Loss of our export markets for primary products for any length of time would, thus, of itself cause widespread hardship, confusion and discontent among us. But this would be only half the story, since without a large volume of exports we could not for long continue to import those things which our economy must have if it is to continue to function.

Where would we be without U.S. parts for the motor cars we make, and without gasoline made from imported petroleum to run them; without cotton for our textiles, and machinery to spin and weave it; to say nothing of orange juice for breakfast, coal to cook and heat with, and green vegetables to keep us in health during our long winters?

Should Moscow decree the continuance or the extension of austerity within her borders, and within those of her satellites, she could undoubtedly create export surpluses with which to cause us the most acute embarrassment and danger. For Russian dumping on the commodity markets of the world would be certain to lead to such depression and hardship as we have never known.

In the face of such a situation, we must watch for every sign of Russia's intentions, since they seem bound to be of vital interest to us.

Here is, perhaps, a straw in the wind: It was recently announced from London that the Russians are meeting the price rises in the United States by reducing the price of their commodities for export. It is also said that, coupled with it, there is to be a new drive by Russia for overseas trade. This may, in fact, be the opening shot of a campaign for the capture of markets in which we have hitherto enjoyed a preferred position.

It must thus be said that despite the belief of Mr. Welles that Communism and Democracy can both inhabit the same world, Moscow's recent actions do not give much assurance that we are free from the threat of destructive Russian competition in world markets.

Although she was present at Bretton Woods, Russia has so far declined to ratify the resulting agreements. he has also refused to enter into any of the more important International trade organizations sponsored by Britain and the United States in the hope of rescuing the world from economic chaos. As if to make matters worse, the recently concluded Russo-Swedish trade agreement does considerable violence to the policy of non-discriminatory trade which the United States regards as essential to post-war multilateral trade.

Out of depression might well come the degree of social and political confusion most essential to the spread of Communism amongst us. With large sections of our country already supporting radical political movements; and with the Communists pursuing relentlessly their declared objectives, it is far from inconceivable that a prolonged depression would see Canada within the Russian orbit.

But no one really begins to know at this moment either what Russia plans to do, even in the near future; nor the actual extent of Communism's progress toward the ideological conquest of our country. One suspects, indeed, that the extent of such an ideological conquest may not become really apparent until we fall upon the bad times which the Canadian communists are quite evidently determined to create here by their subversive actions.

What, then, would be the effect upon the democracies of our ideological conquest? What would happen if we found ourselves within the Russian orbit? Britain's position as an independent world power would certainly be well-nigh hopelessly compromised thereby. For if Russia were to control the "granary of Empire", she could always back up the exercise of her will in the field of international politics with very potent threats of starvation against Britain.

In the second place, the United States would have lying on her very frontier a regime, totalitarian in method if not in name, inherently stronger than the totalitarian governments of Latin America, and backed by one of the strongest of world powers.

Furthermore, a Canada lying within the Russian orbit would not only be a formidable ideological bridgehead, it would also constitute a military threat of no mean order. If only for that reason, most Canadians will probably be disposed to assume that the possibilities here outlined will never be allowed to come to pass—that somehow the United States would prevent.

But would the United States appreciate the trend of events in Canada in time to do anything about it? What, in fact, could they do about it? Remember—the conquest of Canada in the first instance at least, would be ideological, and the result of economic measures taken against us to bring on depression. Experience has proven only too clearly that measures for counteracting the effects of depression are difficult to devise; and usually unsuccessful.

What could we ourselves do in such a situation? It would be useless of course, to expect our social legislation to offset the effects of a collapse of world primary production prices; since our dependence on exports is so great that there can be no substitute for the contribution they make to our national income. How likely indeed would we be to recognize sufficiently early the cumulative results of the various subversive activities which, even today, are going on all about us?

When you ponder all these facts, the importance of the disclosures of our Royal Commission on Espionage becomes more evident; especially since the Commission itself admitted that only one of five alleged espionage rings in Canada has been so far uncovered.

Let me sum up my remarks by reminding you again that Communism is still on the move; with the overthrow of capitalism as its declared objective: that Canada stands between Communism and the last great citadel of capitalism; and that Canada is now economically very vulnerable vis-à-vis Russia.

But you will notice that in all I have said I have not been able to answer the pregnant question which forms the title of my remarks today. I warned you at the outset that such would be the case.

All anyone can do, and all that I have tried to do, in fact, is to raise the question in your minds. My hope is that by so doing, I may help to ensure that if the question "Do we face ideological conquest?" ever has to be answered, the answer will be a resounding negative.

Let me warn you, however, if the answer is to be in the negative, it is clearly necessary that the people of Canada become alive to the dangers in which the post-war world abounds. There are, unfortunately, many indications that, as a nation, we are not yet fully aware of the perils which may lie in our path.

"CITIZENSHIP"

AN ADDRESS BY

HON. WILLIAM J. STEWART, O.B.E.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse.

Thursday, October 31st, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Your Worship, Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air: Our guest of honor today is known to a multitude of friends simply as "Bill". During the seven years in which he served this city so efficiently as Alderman we were accustomed to greet him by this appellation. In the years 1931 to 1934, during which period he served us so faithfully as Mayor of our city, we knew him as "Your Worship". From 1938, when elected to the Provincial Legislature, to the present time, when formality demands, we use the prefix "The Honorable". And at the Queen's York Rangers Regiment he is "Colonel". However, through this succession of dignities he remains to us simply "Bill", that dynamic personality who sponsored the First Canadian Corps Re-Union—who holds the Chairmanship of the Greater Toronto Veterans Hospital Committee—who advocated the teaching of citizenship to new and native-born Canadians—and who was honored by His Majesty, The King, in 1935 in being made Commander of the British Empire.

Gentlemen—it is my pleasure to present *Hon. Wm. Stewart,* C.B.E., M.P.P., whose subject will be "What are your individual rights?"

Mr. Stewart—

HON. WILLIAM J. STEWART: Mr. President, Mr. Mayor, Reverend Sir, Mr. Dunlop, Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen:

I was very much interested in your introduction and I am sure my good friend, our good Mayor, will agree that when you are addressed with your titles, oftentimes the salutation is a flattering, seeking a favour. When they call you by your own name you know you are meeting a friend.

As I look about the room today and see our good Chief Constable Chisholm here, and our senior Magistrate, Bob Brown, I can repeat what Bob Brown has many times said, "I see many familiar faces."

To many of you it is no secret that I am pinch-hitting today. I am deeply sensible of the signal honour that under the wise, progressive leadership of The Empire Club it is noted for speakers of national and international repute, and it is indeed a very high privilege when a local member is accorded such deviation from custom.

I trust that upon the conclusion of my remarks your frame of mind toward me will not be the same as Disraeli's toward one of his followers who insisted upon speaking to the House that day, Disraeli said, "I don't think you should."

"But my constituents will be wondering why I didn't if I don't."

"Young man", said Disraeli, "it is much better to have them wondering why you didn't than why you did."

I hasten to assure you that my remarks will be non-partisan. I speak from notes, as a safeguard, and to preserve the ancient tradition of the Office of Speaker of the House, the Speaker of the House presents no partisan views—publicly.

The subject assigned me today is "What are My Individual Rights?"

Does anyone need to be told? Each has an individual right to assume and discharge to the full the duties of Citizenship—rights, carefully established and fully observed; duties, neglected and too often forgotten. Rights are often stressed at the expense of duty.

I know of no more fitting environment than the Empire Club, such well tilled ground, to cultivate the seed of good citizenship. Down through the years the Club has consistently held for the ideals and given spendid leadership that nourishes the spirit, that strengthens the spirit of allied parts of the British Empire.

The Empire—the British Empire—a sleepless sentinel on the frontiers of Freedom. The Beacon Light of true Democracy, and you have seen to it that the salt of the Empire spirit has never lost its savour.

Rights—since time immemorial, the just state is one in which all individuals freely enter into agreement to abide by the decisions of the majority. Natural rights, down through the years, have become known as civil rights.

You have the right of possession, the right of life, and to enjoy any and all these rights, law is indispensable—tempered by reason. Consequently, government is a necessity.

If we value our rights, and if we are to preserve our well-established, time-honoured, democratic institutions, we must realize that the life blood of the body of rights is the active discharge of the duties of citizenship.

What are my individual rights? An American has said that Right is a higher law than the Constitution.

> For Right is Right, since God is God,
> And Right, the day must win,
> To doubt would be disloyalty,
> To falter would be sin.

However, our duties, like the privileges of Citizenship are taken just for granted. Citizenship is an inescapable individual responsibility. The citizens are the city, and like St. Paul, I can say with you, Mr. Mayor, we are citizens of no mean city. We are the trustees of the priceless privileges of Canadian citizenship—a free and willing partner—forever, I pray, united under the British Empire.

Many do not know, many do not realize that we do not pay forced tribute to the Motherland. We are not bound by chains, but by silken, unbreakable threads. A trust that we, as trustees, should cherish to hand on to future generations, unspotted, untarnished and enriched.

As we turn from the conflict of war, the problems of peace confront us, as a challenge to our very life, a challenge that should stir to action the noblest and best that is in each one of us.

May we each resolve to assume our individual responsibility and with those who served in His Majesty's Forces develop and help govern this country of ours in the same superlative way in which so many of them fought for it.

Peace has her victories no less renowned than war. With privilege there are duties, rights, responsibilities, and many know their rights, Your Worship, but how few fully discharge their duties.

What price this liberty we now enjoy—many have been born into it, without any service or sacrifice. It is your responsibility and mine to teach many of us, and the rising generation that eternal vigilance is the price of Liberty. We have subtle foes around us, apparently harmless, constantly boring from within. Germany, by apathy to government, permitted the organization and the rise of the Nazi Party. Gentlemen, apathy to the Church of our faith, and apathy to duties of State is a growing national ailment in Canada. Too many people, just like pre-digested foods, accept radio comments and newspaper headlines, and accept without ever reading them through, as gospel truth. We fail in many cases to think for ourselves, and if we do think at all too many never translate their thinking into action.

Peace depends upon our way of thinking. I think we should be reminding ourselves of the fact that in the feudal days soldiers could be hired to do the fighting. That day has gone forever. In this atomic age what does war mean? It means for men, women and children, obliteration, annihilation of the whole human race.

We boast of Democracy. We have never tried Democracy in this city, in this province or in this country to the full. Democracy is the use of the franchise from which a free government is refined, and I would say to you bad government is the result of unused voting power. In a democracy the sovereignty of power is vested in the people, not the monarch or not the President, The government deriving its power by the consent of the governed.

But we have betrayed Democracy and in my opinion if we continue in this city, this province and this country to neglect our duties, it will no longer mean government for, of, and by the people. It will be government of the people by minority—if not slavery. I believe in minority rights and concede them, but I also submit for your earnest consideration, there is still such a thing as majority rights. And with rights, again I say, duties.

Mr. Mayor you have quoted the figures, that in this great city of ours, this capital, in 1946 there were 363,475 voters entitled to vote for the Council, and 25.6 cast a ballot—about 90,000 people. In other words, three out of four never bother their heads to go to the polls to elect a civic government. Just ten days ago in the riding I have the honour to represent as a provincial Member, you had a federal election and 6,225 fewer votes were cast than in the last general election. Forty-three per cent of the people never bothered their head.

In Ontario in your last general election you had, in round figures, 2.5 million votes—something over 1,700,000 were cast. Over 700,000 people never went to the polls—a population almost as great as the City of Toronto. Do you call that Democracy?

Gentlemen, war comes. Our sons don His Majesty's uniform and they go forth to serve and to sacrifice and to protect our way of life, while three out of four in this city betrayed the very thing for which they died.

You hear public men say we are going to make this a land fit for our heroes to dwell in. Have we kept faith with those who went? Have we supported any Church? Do we ever go to the polls to vote? Have you done anything in improve government? Did you exercise your franchise? Can you name any single, solitary thing that you have done in any phase of life to make this a land fit for heroes to dwell in?

I remind you of the very close relationship between national security and personal integrity. Gentlemen, surely a country worth fighting for, worth suffering for, and worth dying for is at least worth voting for and worth living for.

The war clouds are parted today, but they have not vanished. Conditions, as we know, about us today present this question: Is law and order to continue or is incipient anarchy to take its place?

This Canada of ours, from the Atlantic, from the historic Maritimes up to the wealth and abundance of the banner Province of Ontario, across the great prairies and the majestic Rockies to the Okanagan Valley and the forests of British Columbia is a mighty country. Will you deny the fact this is the prize our enemies sought?

However, the greatness of any national cannot be measured by the strength, by the wealth, by the territory or by its population. Such stand but on feet of clay. But rather it is measured by its intellectual clearness, the moral calibre of its people and the collective loyalty to the Crown and their faith and belief in Divine Providence.

Are we doing our part to have a united Canada? If we are it requires the common aim, a common vision, a common purpose, and a common loyalty. Let us awaken ourselves to our duties if we are to keep this Canada of ours predominantly British as it should be. We have got to do something to seek to attract and to hold the men who graduate from our universities. It is a great tribute to them that they are sought the world over. There must be a great magnetic power to a country lying alongside us with 130 millions against our 12 millions. That is quite natural. In the last 25 years, our increase in population has been 3,328,947, while those migrating to the United States were 3,409,184, which leaves a minus of over 80,000 people.

I find going about the population you meet people who say what is the government going to do about this? What is the government going to do about that? They are placing all their faith in legislation while we have evidence at hand of government's failure to enforce existing legislation. Yet we are asking for more—depending on the law of force—deploring regimentation, yet asking for it.

It has been stated that across this world we have 35 million man-made laws with, in my opinion, no improvement on the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

We of a passing generation, from our experience, can say to those at present arising, if you wish something to be done the best way to have it done is to participate in the doing of it and as the shadows of evening lengthen about you and me, from the rising generation it is our obligation to the state to produce leaders and enlightened followers.

Guided by the past, from the rich treasures of spoils and memory comes a challenge to the present to preserve for the future as Canadians, the priceless heritage of Canadian Citizenship, forever in the British Empire.

Our privileges and opportunities must be shared with others. The world is not going to allow Canada to keep this land to herself. Immigration is imminent. In my opinion we should seek only to attract to this country people that we are willing to assimilate, socially, politically and economically. Clearly and fully advise them before they come what is expected of them, and then when they come, give them the right hand of fellowship and keep faith.

But there is more required to make an immigrant a good citizen than a healthy body and a job. There must be that willingness of spirit to lay aside the ideas of the old world and to absorb Canadian ideals. New Canadians with native born Canadians should side by side, strive to build a united Canada, but we, by passive acquiescence are daily contributing to the disintegration of the country we profess to love.

Gentlemen, for our own safety of life and property, and in defence of new Canadians who have made such a splendid contribution to the upbuilding of our country and who are good citizens and use their franchise, it is unfair we should stigmatize any race or races by referring to them as "foreigners" or holding up someone who has broken the law and saying, "There is what you get." The Naturalization Act provides a way to deal with that situation and when someone comes from another country and we accord them the high privileges of citizenship and they break the law and serve their time and are defiant, then retract their citizenship and send them back to where they came from. By example and by education we have to teach many about us that there is only one national anthem in Canada, and that is forever, "God Save The King." And in this great country of ours, with unlimited room for additional population, anybody whose mental attitude is defiant and who will not sing that anthem and subscribe to it, for them there is no room in Canada.

A United States delegation speaker that I had the opportunity of hearing the other evening, a dignified gentlemen, made an eloquent address in which he said, "I believe the peace of the world would be assured if there was an understanding by men of each other's ideals and ideas, and the surest pathway would be to have the English language the language of communication for the entire world. Then men could understand each other."

Gentlemen, by our indifference to newcomers we force these people to continue their racial groups. It is your job and it is my job to assimilate them and to this end, not legislation but education is the solution.

I presented my views to the Prime Minister of Ontario, who is also Minister of Education. He had already appointed the Ontario Adult Education Board, known for a time as Universities Adult Education, and embracing all the universities of Ontario. A false impression was created in the minds of some people that it was for the purpose of attracting only university graduates. That was absolutely never the intention. So, to correct that impression it is now known as the Ontario Adult Education Board. The plan is for instruction for all the people, regardless of their academic standing or achievements.

The Ontario Adult Education Board in their wisdom saw fit to appoint a Citizenship Committee of representative citizens, of which I have the distinct honour of being the Chairman, for the sole purpose of organizing for the teaching of Citizenship. The plan is an enlightened and educated democracy, and the approach was made to the Inter-Church Council and we have their endorsation for which we are extremely grateful, and they have made available the use of any church property for that purpose. The idea is that side by side, new Canadians and native born will sit together in good environment—not the beer parlour or the barber shop—to discuss public matters. When we get classes going they can be in the church buildings and a syllabus of training prepared by the Department of Education will be given for instruction and upon graduation those who have attended the classes will receive a certificate to that effect.

Prior to that, for new Canadians who cannot read, write or speak the English language, a splendid service has been rendered for some time past by the Toronto Board of Education, under the able and splendid leadership of Mr. Monkman—I am very happy that he is here today—in the teaching of basic English.

The Harbord Street Collegiate the other evening was thronged to the doors, and as necessity arises other centres will be established in Toronto. Then the new Canadians can come into our Citizenship Classes where we will tell them from a text book, now in course of preparation, something of the Constitution of our country, something of the systems of government and the duties of Citizenship, and this text book will hold forth to all who may read it that as a nation we believe in the Divine Providence and something of the value we place upon human life, that it is not to be taken cheaply, and something of the duties of citizenship.

It is planned in the near future to have a Graduation Day for all the native born Canadians.

Gentlemen, on what principle have we always assumed because a man or woman becomes 21 years of age they can with intelligence and appreciation use their franchise? We have done nothing to enlighten them. We sincerely hope, possibly on Dominion Day, possibly across all the centers of population, the young men and young women who attain their 21st birthday will present themselves, hear a charge delivered to them on the duties of Citizenship and be given a certificate of Canadian Citizenship. In September this year, the Legislative Chamber, the Cabinet, invited the Members of the House, the Church and Judiciary and representative organizations of all classes and we had a composite choir, representing all the friendly nations of the world who rendered an anthem "One World", and the Royal Regiment band played patriotic numbers. The Prime Minister of this Province, with his customary eloquence outlined the purpose of the Ontario Adult Education Board in a most constructive address and our friend, Dr. W. J. Dunlop and his Board were present and the Doctor's inspiring address was further evidence of his able leadership. Also present was the Citizenship Council and a feature of the evening was the presence of Major Foote, V.C., of Dieppe, when he emulated the example of the body you referred to, Mr. President, the Canadian Corps, when in 1934, 150,000 people, under the leadership of Canon Scott, placed their right hand upon their heart and said, "I hereby declare my faith and belief in Almighty God and reaffirm my loyalty and allegiance to His Majesty, the King, and further declare myself for British institutions. God Save the King."

For a long time you never heard a peep out of the subversive elements. There was organized citizenry, ready to defend the things we profess to admire.

Across the province the next day after that meeting, the Director of our Council had reports back from the meetings in Sault Ste. Marie, Fort Francis also, Port Arthur has opened classes, Kenora is in process of formation. Paris is opening classes in the Art of Public Speaking. Various other groups are being interviewed and enlisted to the purposes of this Board.

Just a little local touch. One of our Directors reported to me that in the part of the city in which I live a lady born in Russia, who has been here for over thirty years, has a daughter over thirty years of age and the lady could not read, write or speak the English language until Mr. Monkton had her as a student in his class and through his instruction and guidance he has opened up a new world for which she cannot find words to express her appreciation. That was a splendid contribution.

Gentlemen, in the 1930's approximately 2,000 persons each year in Toronto applied for naturalization. In 1944 the Act was changed. It is a two-stage measure now. You file your application of intention and later on apply for naturalization. So far this year 546 have applied. What is the picture in the population of Canada. The official figures from Ottawa from 1935 to 1945 were 124,256 persons who came into Canada, of which 69,882 were English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, and those of other countries numbered 54,374.

Now, since 1945 we have had 52,152 persons come in of which the British subjects numbered 39,469, and those of other countries numbered 12,683. The 1946 figures are not yet available, but I understand there has been quite an influx from various parts of the world.

Gentlemen, Canada as a nation, of her own free will and accord, as a partner in the British Empire, defended and preserved the Sovereignty of Truth, the Inviolability of Honour, the Sacredness of Freedom, the Majesty of Compassion, the Stewardship of Life, under the hand of the Great Architect of the Universe. While we can record the facts of the war and tell the rising generation something of the financial cost in taxes, priorities and rationing—yes, that is quite possible—the human mind cannot reduce to words and fully describe the suffering, the gallant service, the noble sacrifice, the valour and the courage. The price of war can be calculated in dollars, but no one can measure and no one can replace blood, sweat and tears.

Since the First Great War our school text-books did not carry the story of the cost of war, nor the dangers, but rather fifty-five patriotic gems were taken out—

"Flanders' Fields"—"The Story of the Victoria Cross"—"Wolfe and Montcalm"—"Bruce and Douglas". You may say, what has taken their place? Well, you may be interested to know they were replaced by stories on games and pastimes. Stagecraft instead of Statecraft. Nothing of the men who served. Nothing of the men who gave their lives and of the cost of human life.

Then again in 1939, men and women donned the uniform of His Majesty the King, inspired by ideals and by active service, in combat with ruthless enemies, Gentlemen, they witnessed the eternal verities.

Gentlemen, today we are encompassed by a cloud of witnesses, Those who gave their all. They saved you and you, and you and me. And they preserved our heritage. The story of their service and sacrifice must go into our text-books, for the enlightenment of the rising generation. I have reason to believe they will.

Surely they have quickened our sense of individual responsibility, these men who wore our Majesty's uniform in war. Their leadership in war must be sought and continued in Peace.

I heard my Minister tell the story of back in 1850 in Times Square in Broadway, of Frank Mason North as he witnessed the great cosmopolitan flow of people, he went up to his hotel bedroom and looked down upon them, rushing to and fro, a great throng, and he was inspired to write that great hymn:

> "Where cross the crowded ways of life,
> Where sound the cries of race and clan"

Where? When he wrote that, he was in Times Square, Broadway. Where sound the cries of race and clan today? Around the entire world, and they are not cries of joy and gladness. Discordant notes, not harmony. And as the nations of the world struggle to emerge from the hysteria and the anaesthesia of war, from the bodies politic come the cries of discordant notes of fear, of distress and of distrust.

And as the world passes through this period of convalescence, clear thinking, and active citizenship is an individual responsibility, and, Gentlemen, I invite you, as individuals, I invite you as an organization, Mr. President, to participate in the doing of this work and to share in our work. I invite you to Toronto's first classes, their first assembly under the leadership of a distinguished soldier, an outstanding teacher, now a Magistrate—Brigadier Martin. A date will be announced. Can we count on you?

I would like to leave this thought with you: Faith without works is of no avail. Can we count on you?

Gentlemen, I am a British subject. I am proud of it. I am a Canadian, consequently I am a British subject.

"Let none hear you idly saying,
There is nothing I can do,
While our trust men are betraying,
Duty clearly calls for you.
To your task right gladly,
Citizenship your pleasure be,
Answer the invisible cloud of witnesses,
HERE AM I—COUNT ON ME."

Gentlemen, if anyone places anything greater than Liberty, he loses that and Liberty too.

"THE STATE OF FOREIGN TRADE"

AN ADDRESS BY

GEORGE S. MATHIESON

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, November 7, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and also our unseen radio audience. The City of Toronto has dedicated this week, Nov 3rd to Nov. 9th, as "FOREIGN TRADE WEEK" and the activities in this connection have been enthusiastically supported both by the Canadian Exporters' Association and the Department of Trade & Commerce.

The Empire Club is glad to co-operate and is indeed fortunate today in having as its guest-of-honour one who has spent his very active business life in the Grain business, which is so vital to Canada.

Born in Glasgow, educated in Scotland, our guest came to Canada and in 1923 was appointed Assistant Manager of the Norris Grain Company.

Our guest has been four times President of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange; a Director of the Lake Shippers Clearance Assoc.; Secretary of the Shippers & Exporters Association since 1932, and, in addition to his contributions to the world of commerce, has been a generous donor to the cultural life of Canada, having been President of a number of musical organizations, including the Winnipeg Civic Music League.

We are very glad indeed to welcome from Winnipeg, Mr. George S. Mathieson, who will address us on the subject,

"THE STATE AND FOREIGN TRADE"

MR. GEORGE S. MATHIESON: As this is Foreign Trade week in Toronto, it was suggested to me that this would provide a subject about which I might address a few thoughts to you.

I think you will all agree that Foreign Trade is one of the most vital elements in Canadian economy.

On all sides, both at home and abroad, we hear talk of the wonderful natural resources of this land of ours, resources which, in volume, are far beyond what we need at home, and we are told how necessary some of them are to the peoples of the world, especially in Europe and Asia.

Twelve millions of people cannot possibly absorb the abundance of wealth that Canada can, and does produce, in richer profusion year after year, both industrially and agriculturally.

It is of prime importance, therefore, that the channels of trade, through which our surplus resources flow to other markets throughout the world, should be kept as free as possible of obstacles which tend to interrupt or impede that flow.

On the other hand there are commodities and goods that are necessary, or desirable, for our higher standard of living, that cannot be produced, or at least as efficiently produced, in Canada as in other countries. We consumers therefore should aim at easy access to other markets, where these commodities and goods are purchasable by the money received in the sale of our surplus commodities and goods.

Foreign Trade therefore is a two-way street, and every exporter, be he producer, processor or manufacturer, who sees his products passing along this thoroughfare, should welcome a stream of traffic coming the the other way and give it plenty of room, in the knowledge that the heavier the passing traffic is, the greater will be the power, vehicular and financial, able, and willing, to take back with it, the surplus of his products still remaining to be moved.

At the risk of making you feel that chilly draft, which the use of figures seems to create—at least to me—I am indebted to one of my authoritative banking friends for the following analysis.

In the fifty years 1895-1944, taking into consideration exports and imports of goods and commodities, non-monetary gold, travel, interest and dividends, freight, shipping, insurance, and other services, the deficit against Canada in favour of the United States was 163 millions per annum. On the other hand in the same period Canada's trade with countries, other than the United States, showed a surplus in favour of Canada of 307 millions per annum, which left an overall surplus in Canada's favour of 144 millions.

In 1939 the figures were 116 millions deficit with the United States, a surplus with other countries of 242 millions, or a net surplus of 126 millions in Canada's favour.

Before the war the surplus of sterling and other currencies was turned into U. S. dollars, through its sale in the open exchange markets—principally New York.

The funds so converted were mostly invested at home or abroad, or used in industrial and other expansion in Canada.

All this is of course mere platitudinism, and has been said many times more forcibly and effectively by others, but the danger of all platitudes is that their force is dulled by repetition, and their admitted truth allowed to lie dormant. Do not therefore let us be lulled into an atmosphere of drift. Rather let us try to clarify the problems of Foreign Trade in our own minds.

You have heard it said again and again that at the end of this war to end wars, things would not be the same as they were before the war. Statements made by responsible statesmen in the leading nations, indicated that the days of isolation were gone, that no nation can live unto itself, and that international trade would be developed as a great instrument, for the preservation of prolonged peace, and for fostering the brotherhood of man. No man busy in trade has time for thoughts of war.

It is now fifteen months since the last of the Axis powers was defeated, but peace is not yet with us. Violence still holds up its ugly head in China, and Palestine, and in less degree in India. The Paris Conference is over after a troublous series of sessions, and we now await the reactions of the Big Four this month.

In the United States industrial unrest is impairing production, and efforts to curb inflation are encountering difficulty after difficulty. In Canada the situation is better, but nobody can say it is satisfactory.

In Great Britain export trade has been stepped up to over pre-war figures, and doubtless her sterling indebtedness is being reduced. But her people there are still on rationed food and clothing, and the housing situation is bad.

The obstacles to a broader international trade still exist. Reduction in tariffs, removal of embargoes and quotas, are not yet accomplished facts. Cartels and Imperial Preference still hold sway. No nation seems ready to move in the international economic field until the political skies are cleared, and these are still cloudy and overcast, although the forecast is for clearing and more settled weather.

This delay, however, in cleaning up the political mess of aftermath of war, only cultivates the ground from which rises the poisonous growth of socialism, with its stultifying effects on human endeavour.

In Great Britain a socialist government is in power, returned at the last election with an unexpectedly strong majority, on the wave of a welter of promises of reforms. but so far they have only been able to put a few into effect.

The nationalization of the Bank of England was largely a matter of form because in effect it was really under government influence although financed by private capital.

The nationalization of the coal mines was not unexpected, both miners and mine owners being largely to blame for conditions in the industry. The nationalization however has not stepped up production, coal still being in short supply.

The steel industry has not been taken over, the Government confining its actions to the appointment of a supervisor.

Conditions in the cotton industry are not satisfactory, no substitute having been found for the Cotton Futures market which was closed by the Government.

The Rubber Industry, which the Government tried to control, proved uncontrollable, and latest reports indicate that the Rubber Futures Market may soon be reopened.

In Canada our own Government has not escaped this infection, as has been evidenced by the recent bilateral agreements with the British Government in wheat and beef, and it is to this development of state trading that I propose to direct your attention for a little.

This Anglo-Canadian agreement is the latest convulsion which has attacked the Agricultural Economy of Western Canada. Whether or not it will be the culminating phase of thirty years of pestilence lies with people like you. It rests with public opinion, which alone can decide, how far it will let the state interfere with the individual.

I realize how difficult it is to make the generality of people, not actually in the grain business, realize the threat to all business, that underlies this latest action by their Government.

The Grain Trade, from the farmer to the miller and exporter, has developed throughout the past sixty years into a highly specialized organism, which, despite the Government interference of the past two decades, has worked like a well-oiled machine. Its very efficiency and smoothness of operation have created in the minds of many people, especially among farmers, a feeling of mystery, and suspicion of too much oil or grease.

The Trade embraces Country Elevator Companies, Terminal Elevator Companies, Transit Elevator Companies, Exporters, Millers, Feed Dealers, Vessel Owners, Brokers, and Commission Merchants, all of which are units of trade within themselves, in active competition with each other, and yet, as a whole, providing the greatest example of co-operation in the Dominion, possibly in the world today.

Yet there are very few members of that Trade which understand its operation from A to Z. They are experts in their own branch of the trade, but a Country Elevator Owner's knowledge of the export or milling business is on a par with the knowledge of an exporter or miller's, of the Country Elevator business.

And that is the business which the socialists and some politicians, and other agitators, think the bureaucrats can handle efficiently in a highly competitive world market.

As has already been pointed out modern political thought claims, that no nation can live unto itself; the problems of today are international, and the idea of national isolation must be discarded.

What is true internationally is also true federally of the nine provinces of Canada, and important issues in one or more of these provinces have repercussions in the other provinces, and affect the Dominion economy as a whole.

Therefore I claim that it is your privilege, nay your duty, as Canadian citizens, to have opinions, and state them, on matters affecting the West, just as it is the privilege, and duty, of the West to have opinions, and express them, on events say in Hamilton, Sault-ste Marie or Sydney.

Let me tell you therefore, in some detail, how this socialistic encroachment on a great business has come about—not like a fairy tale but the very reverse of such: more like the growth of an ugly cancer which is eating into the very vitals of Canada's economic being.

After the first world war, the Farmers' organizations in Western Canada, hearing of some alleged successes achieved by fruit farmers in California, in the pooling system of handling their products, invited a gentleman, called Aaron Sapiro, to explain to Western Farmers how this system could apply to grain. He addressed meetings from Winnipeg to the Rockies, and the final result was the formation of provincial pools in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

The pool principle is that the farmers should deliver their grain to a central organization, and receive an initial payment, and a participation certificate showing the amount of grain delivered.

Thereafter the pool would handle the grain in the markets of the world at cost, cutting out the services of all intermediaries, and from the profits return to the farmer a final payment, computed on the basis of the amount of grain he delivered, as shown on his participation certificates.

These Pools induced thousands of farmers to contract to deliver their grain to the pools for a five-year period, under penalty of action at law, and the game began.

It was of course presumed that the wisdom of the Pool managers would ensure, that the initial payment would be such, that there would always be a profit, and no provision was made for a possible loss.

Alas for the frailty of man's judgment, the initial price finally got too high, and the three Pools all went broke.

The Three Provincial Governments had finally to come to their rescue by putting up millions of dollars, and the Federal Government aided their operations by appointing a Stabilizer to their Central Selling Agency.

Eventually the Government, by act of parliament, established the Canadian Wheat Board which took over the functions for which this Central Selling Agency had been supposedly created.

Now you may well wonder how this came about. Well, in the first few years of their existence the three pools delivered their wheat to the Central Selling Agency who had applied for and had been elected to membership in the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. In these early days this Agency used the facilities of the Exchange in disposing of pool grain.

Later, however, their ambition soared and they engaged extensively in direct export business, carrying heavy stocks and shipping wheat unsold without using the hedging facilities of the Exchange. The result was disaster.

In 1929 European crops were poor, the Argentine crop was close to a failure, and this central selling agency, working in consultation with the Farm Board of the United States, came to the conclusion, that Europe would have to come to the North American continent for wheat, and that the North American continent could dictate the price, which they set at not less than $2.00 per bushel. I must admit that considerable public opinion encouraged that view and at least one prominent Canadian financier endorsed it publicly.

At that time, and in the early thirties, there were stirring those elements that finally resulted in war, and it has never ceased to be my personal opinion that this attempt, in 1929-30, to hold up Europe on the price of wheat, awakened the nations of Europe to the precarious position in which they would find themselves, if, in the event of war, they had to depend on foodstuffs from the outside world.

For, from that time on, there sprang up in importing countries, a system of protective tariffs, quotas, and even total embargoes, against imported wheat. Simultaneously, subsidies and high prices, were guaranteed and paid, to encourage farmers in these importing countries to grow wheat domestically.

The final result is soon told. In 1927-28 Canada exported 333 millions of bushels of wheat, at an average price of 146¼ for One Northern in store Fort William-Port Arthur, and in 1928-29 she exported 407 millions of bushels, at an average price of 124⅛, and this in competition with heavy exports from the other big three, United States, Australia, and Argentina, who, in the same periods, exported a combined total of 457 and 493 millions of bushels.

In 1938-39 Canada's exports had dropped to 160 millions, and those of the others to 329 millions.

In these earlier years Canada's exports to Europe, excluding the United Kingdom, were 205 and 235 millions respectively. In 1938-39 they were only 51 millions.

Now, I suggest to you, that any business man, on realizing a drop in his turn-over, would investigate the reasons thereof, and noticing how he was losing many of his customers, would immediately get down to root causes for this loss of business, and take such steps, as lay within his powers, to regain his lost markets.

But what happens in Canada? Instead of trying to break down the barriers against the importation of Canadian wheat to Europe, higher traffs on the imposition of goods from these same countries were imposed, and Imperial preference was set up.

At the risk of suggesting something that may not be palatable to members of the Empire Club, do you not think that there is something to the thought, that Imperial preference, within the British Commonwealth, is simply national self-sufficiency on a limited international scale?

I am not arguing in favour of abandoning Imperial preference at the present time. I was informed two years ago by a prominent British M.P., that the British Government, in consultation with the Dominions and Colonies, would hold on to Imperial preference and cartels, until they got something better, which at that time meant the lowering or abolition of U.S. tariffs. A despatch from London about three weeks ago, reporting a press conference given by Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade, confirms this attitude.

> "It is also recognized that the reduction or elimination of preferences could be considered only in relation to, and in return for, reductions of tariffs and other barriers to world trade. There would be no unilateral surrender of preference."

That would seem to be a perfectly logical position to take, world conditions being what they are at the present time.

That however is somewhat of a digression. The point I would like to make is that Canada's national policy, since the decade of the twenties, has tended to antagonize her customers rather than to keep, or regain, their goodwill.

The effect of this decline in export sales was, that the annual carry-over of wheat in Canada rose, despite short crops in 1933-4-5-6-7- from the normal figure of 20 to 30 millions of bushels to 103 millions in 1939, and prices touched an all-time low of 38c in December 1932.

That the depression of the thirties, would have undoubtedly brought about a lower level of wheat prices, than that ruling during the previous decade, can not be disputed. However it is my personal opinion, that the serious decline in the annual volume in sales of such a seasonal product as wheat, and the consequent piling up of a surplus each year, created a buyers market, especially when a large part of the holding was in one hand, the Central Selling Agency, of the Canadian pools. With farmers growing and delivering more wheat than our narrowed list of customers could absorb, the decline was, in my opinion, aggravated. It seems to me to establish a clear demonstration of the adverse effects of concentrated holding, and the corollary of bulk selling.

However, as sometimes happens, luck does turn, but it was no thanks to the pooling idea in practice, or the Government support or policy, that in 1939 Canada had a large surplus carry-over and a good crop. In fact in the seven years 1939-45, Western Canada grew nearly 2800 millions of bushels of wheat, and the carry-over of 103 millions, in August 1939, was down to 69 millions in August 1946. This represents a total disappearance, domestically and for export to our Allies, and a few neutrals, in these six years, of over 2800 millions of bushels of wheat.

But if the United Nations have their way, there are going to be no more wars, and we have to get down to the fundamental peace policy of keeping markets for the exportable surpluses of our natural resources, and of regaining and keeping other markets, which we have lost, largely through our own stupidity.

But what happens?

The Liberal Government, which did a better job during the war than many people expected, had, at the last election, been returned by a narrow over-all majority. Some of the members of the party seemed to be leaning towards th left, and someone, I refrain from mentioning or suggesting names, conceived the idea of making a bulk sale of wheat to the United Kingdom, at prices, over a term of years, that would enable the Government to guarantee the Western farmer a floor price for five years, thereby weakening the forces of the political opposition in the West, and ensuring solidarity in the party itself.

The outcome was the much discussed Anglo-Canadian long term wheat contract, and in order that you can get some idea of what terms Government bulk selling can get, I am going to quote from the Contract itself.

> 1. (a) The United Kingdom Government undertakes to purchase and the Canadian Government undertakes to sell the following quantities of Canadian wheat, which quantities include wheat to be processed into flour for sale to the United Kingdom Government:
>
> (i) within the crop year 1946-47, 160,000,000 bushels;
>
> (ii) within the crop year 1947-48, 160,000,000 bushels;
>
> (iii) within the crop year 1948-49, 140,000,000 bushels;
>
> (iv) within the crop year 1949-50, 140,000,000 bushels;
>
> A bushel shall be of the weight of 60 pounds avoirdupois.
>
> (b) In the event of the United Kingdom requiring from Canada any additional quantities of wheat that the Canadian Government is prepared to make available, such additional quantities which the Canadian Government offers and the United Kingdom accepts shall in all respects be subject to the provisions of this Agreement.
>
> 2. (a) The price per bushel to be paid by the United Kingdom Government to the Canadian Government, on the basis Number One Manitoba Northern, in

store Fort William-Port Arthur, Vancouver or Churchill, shall be as follows:-

(i) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1946-47, $1.55.

(ii) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1947-48, $1.55.

(iii) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1948-49, not less than $1.25.

(iv) In respect of wheat bought and sold in the crop year 1949-50, not less than $1.00.

(b) The actual prices to be paid for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1948-49 shall be negotiated and settled between the United Kingdom Government and the Canadian Government not later than the 31st December, 1947, and prices for wheat to be bought and sold within the crop year 1949-50 shall be negotiated and settled not later than the 31st December 1948. In determining the prices for these two crop years, 1948-49 and 1949-50, the United Kingdom Government will have regard to any difference between the prices paid under this Agreement in the 1946-47 and 1947-48 crop years and the world prices for wheat in the 1946-47 and 1947-48 crop years.

3. It is agreed that the United Kingdom Government may sell or dispose of the wheat and flour purchased under this Agreement in whatsoever manner the United Kingdom Government may deem expedient both in regard to destination and price.

6. It is mutually understood that matters arising from, or incidental to, the operation of this Agreement may at the instance of either party become subjects of discussion between the parties to this Agreement.

I ask you if you can imagine any group of business men getting together, and entering into a contract so loose in its terms.

In the first place it is a bilateral agreement, despite the avowed aims of the United Nations in the direction of International trade, to which both Canada and the United Kingdom have subscribed.

Do you not think that when the Economic and Security Council gets down to discussing tariffs, embargoes, quotas, preferences, cartels etc., the other nations are likely to regard Canada, and the United Kingdom, with prejudiced, not to say hostile, eyes and to question the sincerity of any proposals either may submit?

It is true that politicians have assured other nations, that this was not a bilateral agreement, and that these nations would be given an opportunity to a contract on the same terms. The agreement with the United Kingdom was not made in competition with proposals from other exporting countries, and the execution of similar agreements with other importing countries would not remove the stigma of bilateralism. But as a matter of fact, no such new contracts have been announced. On the other hand, sales have been made to Belgium, and the Netherlands, at 60c per bushel higher, than the sale price in the contract with the British Government, and several millions of bushels have been sold to other countries, in the form of flour, based on wheat prices 50c to 60c above the price to the United Kingdom.

Canada has at least sixty customer nations, other than the United Kingdom. Can you believe that this kind of dealing makes for regaining the goodwill of the customers that were lost in the thirties, because of a parallel hold-up policy?

Take again the provision which permits the United Kingdom to resell part of the wheat and flour so purchased. Recent London despatches say that the United Kingdom has no intention of reselling any wheat, but shipment has been made to South Africa, and paid for by the United Kingdom at $1.55, the contract price. The sale price to South Africa is not known. Is it not logical to assume that other countries are being supplied by the United Kingdom, and it may be, at prices higher than the price in the Anglo-Canadian contract?

The normal import of Canadian wheat and flour into the United Kingdom was, prior to the war, around, 90 to 100 millions of bushels. It is claimed that all the 600 millions of wheat specified in the contract will be used in the United Kingdom. What then becomes of the relations of the United Kingdom with the United States, Argentine, and Australia, all of whom are large exporters of wheat? And yet under the contract, the United Kingdom may, like Oliver Twist, "ask for more."

If this contract had been made at the request of the United Kingdom, to tide them over a difficult time, a statement to that effect would have disarmed criticism.

But the terms appear so favourable to the United Kingdom, that, obviously, it was Canada that desired the contract, as being advantageous to her as seller, and the apologists for the contract plead this advantage in extenuation.

Take the matter of price alone. It is one thing to supply the United Kingdom with wheat, during war time, at prices well below world values, even although it was done in the form of Mutual Aid, which of course the taxpayer paid. The only objection there could be was that, at such prices, the farmer, as a taxpayer and a producer, was paying an undue share. Some case might be made out for continuing to supply wheat at such a relatively low price, for a year or so, until the international situation was more settled, but, to extend the contract to the end of the 1949-50 crop-year, implies a confidence in price levels, on the part of the United Kingdom, which should have made the Canadian Government pause. Or do the bureaucrats at Ottawa think they are wiser than the experts in the City of London, with centuries of experience behind them.

Personally I have no opinion on wheat price levels for the next four years. I have been too long in the trade to know anything about the future trend of prices. It is only theorists, bureaucrats, academic wiseacres, and junior clerks, who can tell you all about future wheat prices.

But I can suggest physical difficulties some of which have shown up already.

Recently there were over 60 boats at one time in the St. Lawrence waiting for wheat which is not there, for the reason that the Western farmer is not excited about the Government filling its contract with the United Kingdom. He is not rushing his wheat to market. He is guaranteed a floor price of $1.35 anytime during the next four years. He does not need the money; he never was better fixed financially; he sees $2.23 as the price at which wheat is selling to countries other than the United Kingdom, and he can never tell, but what the day may come, when he will be allowed to sell as he pleases; he has work on the farm to do before the winter comes in; he learned the trick of storing his wheat on the farm during the war years, when he was restrained from marketing his wheat on account of lack of elevator storage space. This year's western crop is estimated at 50% of last year's crop.

It would appear that stocks in Eastern positions during the winter are likely to be the lowest in years, and the United Kingdom will probably be calling for wheat which the Government cannot ship, because it is back in the West. Will the United Kingdom, in that event, be forced to go for supplies to the United States, or Argentine, at prices well above the Canadian contract price? Already the United Kingdom are reported to have paid $1.95 f.o.b. Argentine for corn.

The contract also envisages the advisability of holding back stocks, next summer, equal to 50% of the contracted quantity, deliverable in the following crop year.

It also suggests control of acreage, and of deliveries, should surpluses later pile up.

There are current contracts for bacon, and a new contract has recently been made for beef, as well as milk, cheese, eggs and other farm products.

It suggests the danger of similar government interjection into other commodities, such as lumber, pulp, fisheries, fruits, metal s,etc.

Bulk selling in general however tends to create a buyer's market in times of normal or abnormal supplies of exportable commodities. There is only one seller; buyers know this, and that the exportable surplus of seasonal commodities must be sold within the crop year. They can therefore be more patient, and conservative in their bids, buying for immediate needs, in the full knowledge that they can get their requirements at any time. This slows up demand, the surplus is slow in being reduced, and is more likely to be increased, and the seller tries to stimulate demand by lowering prices. Acceptance of lower bids suggests an anxiety to sell at lower prices still, and the merry game goes on.

Bulk trading such as this wheat deal, tends, over a period, to sour relations between buyer and seller, as futures price action must suit one or the other, it cannot suit both. One British economic expert concludes his analysis of the deal thus:

> "All told it will be remarkable if this Anglo-Canadian wheat agreement retains its present popularity throughout its four years' life. In my humble opinion somebody has been sold a pup. What very much remains to be seen is who?".

That is one question which only time can answer, but the vital question to which the people of Canada have to give an unqualified reply is, "Are freeborn Canadian citizens to have their everyday lives ordered about by the Government of a socialist state, or are they to be allowed to work out their individual destiny, as they desire, and as their abilities for service to their fellow men can find a place in the community in which they live."

This is no fancied problem, it is a very real one. We in the Grain Trade during the past three years have been autocratically told what grain shall be moved, and to what destination, who shall offer it abroad, to whom it shall be offered, and at what price. Our lake vessel owners have been told what to load, and to what port, and at specified freight rates. The Railway companies have been directed in the supply of box cars. The farmer himself is beginning to squirm under interference with his inalienable rights in the soil, as recent events in the West, economic and political, have demonstrated. These are facts, and the same kind of thing is going on in the Packing industry, and in dairy products. All this has happened at the hands of a Government avowedly opposed to socialism. Had it come about with the socialist party in power, the electorate alone would be to blame, but having elected a non-socialist party to govern us, it is our own fault if the government is to be allowed, without public protest, to undertake such dangerous policies.

The Grain Trade, never dreaming that they should be so betrayed, have been and are making the strongest possible public protests against such unwarrantable encroachments on their liberties, and I suggest to you that business throughout the Dominion must awake to the danger that threatens it before it is too late. It is a national and not a sectional problem. I ask you to face it squarely; on any one of you the axe may fall.

"HEROES OF THE BRITISH MERCHANT FLEET"

AN ADDRESS BY

LORD INVERCLYDE

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, November 14, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air. At our meeting last week the tremendous importance of our export trade was emphasized. Exporting the large volume of raw materials and processed goods from this country means a considerable movement of these goods by ships. Canada's dependence upon ships is, more than ever before, vital to our national life and prosperity. And how equally true this has been of the mother country—both importing and exporting—for hundreds of years. In this community, so far removed from tide-water, we seldom rub shoulders with those men-of-the-sea and consequently our thoughts too seldom turn and our appreciation is too seldom expressed to those heroes of the British Merchant Fleet—those courageous men who have kept the life lines of supplies open in peace and wartime on the seven seas. Through you, sir, director of the British Sailor's Society, we salute that great body of great men —upon whatever water they may be and wish them godspeed and a safe return as they "go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters".

Our guest of honour today, John Allen Burns,—Lord Inverclyde—a graduate of Eton and Sandhurst, though an officer in the army having served with distinction in the Scots Guards in both World War I and the last war—is by tradition a man of the sea. He is a great grandson of Sir John Burns—founder of the great Cunard Steamship Line. The tang of the sea seems to follow Lord Inverclyde relentlessly. In 1940 it was by the sea in a fishing boat that he made his escape from St. Nazaire just a short jump ahead of the rapidly advancing Nazi tank columns. He had another breath of the sea when serving as A.D.C. to the Governor of Gibraltar. For many years he has been a director of the British Sailor's Society and for over twenty years chairman of the Society's Scottish branch. Also for many years he has been active in both the Royal Life Saving Society and the Corps of Sea Cadets.

It gives us much pleasure, sir, to ask you to address us. Gentlemen—Lord Inverclyde.

LORD INVERCLYDE: Mr. President, Members of the Empire Club of Canada, and fellow-guests.

Have you ever thought how much windows, and what we see out of them, affect our ideas?

If from your window you see busy streets and factories, the town will dominate your thoughts; if you look out over green fields and happy farmsteads, your ideas probably are mostly of the country; but if you are as fortunate as I am, and your windows look out over the sea, then your thoughts linger often and long on ships. Ships returning to safe harbour with their hulls bruised after long and hazardous voyages; ships making outwards to the far horizon; ships passing up and down the coats of our sea-girt Homeland.

For the next few minutes look with me through my window; you can see not quite the ocean but one of the greatest gateways—the Firth of Clyde. Away to the North, up to the skyline, run the long green hills of Argyll. Below, there is the wide silver stream of an estuary famous the world over for its beauty and its trade—and for its ships.

Since childhood I have looked on this lovely vista. Mine has been a family of shipowners and I have watched the traffic of the sea with an interest and keenness that just now I should like to communicate to you. When I was a boy I gazed in wonder at the last of the windjammers bearing a burden of memories of the historic days of sail. You won't see them now, but instead, her successors—the freighters after long tussles with the Atlantic enjoying the calm waters of the Clyde; tankers and tugs; truculent little coasters and sturdy wee "puffers." Until recently if it happened to be your lucky day, you might have seen the "Queen Mary" and the "Queen Elizabeth" whose size and magnificence not even the hills could dwarf, nor their war-time coats of grey diminish.

While there is a lull in the boundless unceasing traffic of seaborne trade, let us step away from the window and examine the map that hangs upon my wall. Here we have another seascape. The Seven Seas, criss-crossed by the lines of the big shipping routes; the innumerable ports, large and small, of the Americas, of Canada, of Western Europe, of Africa, of the Far East and of the Antipodes.

These are the high-ways and by-ways of our Merchant Navies, British and Canadian and of many other Nationalities. Across these thousands of miles to those distant ports our ships of all sizes sail through fair weather, through storm, on their lawful occasions. "Overseas Trade" we hear mentioned often; and glibly "We must develop our overseas trade". Well, "Overseas trade" means these thousands of ships, these thousands of trackless miles and many more thousands of men —and the hazards of the unpredictable sea.

I often wish that I could look back--as well as out —through my window to the coming of the square-rigged ships that laid the foundations of our over-seas trade with India, China, Africa and the rest. Those days passed; oak gave way to iron, sail gave way to steam, and from this Firth of Clyde the first steam-ships left their births and set out past those changeless hills across the broad Atlantic.

As has already been stated by your President, my great-grandfather, Sir George Burns, was one of the founders of the Cunard Line. One day, when he was only 17, his eye caught sight of a startling advertisement in a Glasgow newspaper of that time which read as follows: "STEAM PASSAGE BOAT; The "COMET" plying between Glasgow, Greenock and Helensburgh for passengers only. The subscriber having, at much expense, fitted up a handsome vessel to ply upon the River Clyde between Glasgow and Greenock to sail by the power of Wind, Air and Steam, he intends that the vessel shall leave the Broomielaw . . ." and so on, and it was signed "HENRY BELL", 5th August, 1812".

George Burns was down at the Broomielaw the next day in good time to witness the novel sight of the "COMET" steaming away from the quay. She was only 40 feet in length of keel, her engines—which cost £192—were 4 horse-power and she drew 4 feet of water.

With the same keen interest with which he had watched the experiments in gas in his school-boy days, George Burns watched the progress of steam, the great power that was to revolutionize the history of the world. I wonder if he dreamt, perhaps, that he was to have a big part in its development?

A story is told of my great-grandfather when, in 1829, he built in Glasgow a paddle-vessel named "AILSA CRAIG" for the Clyde-Mersey trade.

Friday was the most suitable sailing day from the economic view-point, but not from that of superstition; whereas to sail on Saturday would mean the breaking of the Sabbath.

It was then that Mr. Matthie, one of his partners, wrote from Liverpool to point out that a Friday sailing would not synchronize with the Canal Traffic and, half in jest, he added that it would be better to sail on Saturday and provide a Chaplain aboard.

To his amazement, my forebear took the suggestion seriously, and went so far as to say that he and his brother would share the whole cost of the experiment. The "would-be" wits of the Broomielaw jeered at Captain Hepburn and his "steam Chapel" as they called the "Ailsa Craig", but in a very short time the custom was firmly established and for 12 years the "Ailsa Craig" sailed on Saturdays.

Later, George Burns was destined, with his partners, Samuel Cunard who was born at Halifax and McIver of Liverpool, to build the "BRITANNIA", 207 feet long and with a displacement of 1,154 tons—a very daring venture in 1840. But the pride of the fleet and Clyde-built!

About a hundred years later, from my window, I have watched the latest ship of the Cunard-White Star, the "QUEEN ELIZABETH", the largest liner in the world today. The contrast between the "BRITANNIA" and the "QUEEN ELIZABETH" to me symbolizes the expansion of our Merchant Navy in a single century.

SHIPS and MEN—It was Queen Elizabeth who proclaimed the freedom of the seas to the ships of all nations. Historians have praised the daring and resourcefulness of the Elizabethan sailors, but nothing has happened in the past 1,000 years, which compares with the dauntless courage, endurance and skill of our Merchant Seamen who stood up without flinching or complaining to the onslaught of the pirates of the 20th century.

SHIPS and MEN—these and their needs are the immediate and continuing cause and concern of the BRITISH SAILORS' SOCIETY whose Board of Directors I am here to represent today. It is the oldest Society working for the welfare of Seamen, having been established in 1818, and if I speak chiefly of its activities in Scotland it is because I am more conversant with them there than anywhere else, although I should emphasize that we have a chain of stations in most of the principal Ports throughout the world, manv of which I have seen, on the Continent in the Mediterranean and around the coast of India, in Iceland, South America, the U. S. and Australia. And I should explain that although the word "British" appears in our title or designation, the services of the Society are available at all times to seamen of every nationality, and there are records of many men who have gone round the world keeping constantly within the broader limits of the Society by making use of its world-wide services.

In September, 1939, the British Sailors' Society had only 3 premises in Scotland, while at one period during the war we were maintaining there no less than 23 Sailors' Rests or Canteens, from Aberdeen in the North to Stranraer in the South, and from Oban in the West to Grangemouth in the East. Today, when we have closed those that had become redundant, we still have more than a dozen in Scotland alone in full operation, and amongst these of a very fine, permanent Sailors' Centre built at Greenock in 1943. This building has 84 single bedrooms and a private chapel. It was declared open by the Duchess of Kent who described it as providing "the finest residential quarters for Seamen in this Country" and this year we were honoured there by a visit from Princess Elizabeth, who on a previous occasion had been graciously pleased to declare open our modernized Sailors' Home at Aberdeen.

In addition, in 1942, the Society built a 60 ft. twin Diesel-engined Ambulance Launch and this vessel rendered meritorious service bringing casualties ashore in the Clyde Anchorages in all weathers.

Work in all these Hostels to which I have referred, and all of which I visited from time to time, was of an intense nature but I should like to speak in particular of the Clyde area where, in 1940, the Admiralty established the Headquarters of the greatest Naval Base in history, and where later on the Fighting French established *their* Naval Base.

Few people realized at that time, in 1940, that with the growing importance of the Western Approaches, the Clyde Estuary, and adjoining lochs, were to become the focal point and haven for the great Armada of ships and men, which, and who, kept our Atlantic life-line intact. The situation was completely different from that of 1914 when the Irish ports were open and *they* were the main Naval Bases in the West.

The importance of the Clyde was increased by the enemy's bombing which paralysed the English Channel ports and the southern seaboard. As the battle of the

Atlantic became more and more intense, and U-boat activity reached its peak, the Clyde became No. 1 base for the British Empire.

When the Home Fleet temporarily deserted Scapa Flow after the sinking of the "Royal Oak", it sought the shelter of what we call "The Tail of the Bank", and during those days every type of warship and merchant-ship was to be seen at the anchorage off Greenock, secure behind the impenetrable double row of steel nets which formed the anti-submarine boom stretching from the Cloch Lighthouse over to Dunoon and which I could see from my bedroom window.

Exciting weeks and months followed and although one could not freely talk about it, we watched with growing interest the comings and goings of famous ships on mysterious missions.

It was at Greenock that H.M.S. "Rodney" accompanied by the new aircraft carrier "Victorious" and cruisers and destroyers, arrived from the engagement and destruction of the "Bismarck", while other craft fresh from hunting down enemy submarines in the Atlantic often returned there with captured Nazi sailors, and German ships too, intercepted on the high seas.

On the Clyde were assembled great convoys of merchantships for every theatre of war, and on occasions fleets of several hundred ships were dispersed over the anchorage, a million tons at one time, and the crews of most of these ships were aided, directly or indirectly, by the British Sailors' Society through its seven Hostels within the area.

For two years, or more, day after day, and at all hours of the night, winter and summer, shipload after shipload of survivors from torpedoed or mined ships were brought into the Clyde and there was always a representative of the Society to meet them and to ensure that instant relief was given in the way of lodging, medical attention, food, clothes and money.

There were many sad spectacles among these survivors, many landing in scanty attire and with bare feet and frozen limbs, until the time came when the Society was able to step into the breach by maintaining on board each Rescue Ship, 100 sets of warm clothing, the sets being replenished each time the vessel returned from a rescue operation, and in this particular connection I should like to mention with deep gratitude the gifts in kind sent over to us by the Imperial Order of the Daughters of the Empire, whose association with the Society dates back a long time—indeed to the First World War, in 1916, some 30 years ago.

Those days of Rescue Ships and survivors are now over. White wings are to be seen on the Clyde again, our River Steamers, paddle and turbine, many of which have been on war service since Dunkirk, have been redecorated in their coats of many colours and have resumed the wearing of their "old school funnels", while our lighthouses have shed their camouflage and glisten again in the sun like giant snowmen.

But in peace, as in war, the work of the British Sailors' Society goes on.

I came to Canada in order to establish closer relations with the Society's Dominion Council whose Headquarters are in Toronto and to make a survey of the work being done. Since landing at Halifax on the 14th of September, I have flown across to the West Coast and back on two occasions, and I have visited every place from Port Alberni to Sydney where the Society is represented. Good work is being done at the various centres and an endeavour will now be made to provide better canteen facilities and a higher standard of accommodation—that is to say that each man should have a room to himself; for be certain that the seamen, when ashore, values his privacy as much as any other man.

But I should like to see established in Canada a Welfare Department such as we have in the Old Country. To this department the seaman comes because he is perplexed. He tells of his worries—his home that is suffering because he is sick, or out of work, of personal troubles or ambitions. Or his wife or dependants come in distress through some change of fortune, or bewildered by some unfamiliar procedure. Often all that is required is to explain official information in simple words and at a pace which it can be assimilated by those unaccustomed to picking up new ideas.

Every year the Society helps between 125,000 and 150,000 sailors, and their families, in an infinite variety of ways such as providing fares to distant homes, fares to reach new employment, articles of clothing, books, medical comforts, arrears of rent, new dentures, artificial limbs, or helping them to get in touch with the authorities as regards pay, pensions and so on, while the Chaplains have the task of breaking the news of bereavements to wives and parents. Furthermore, the Society maintains an Ocean Library Service and there are well over 6,000 Library Cabinets afloat today, each Cabinet containing a Bible and 30 books by the best and most popular authors. These books may be exchanged at any Port throughout the world, where the British Sailors' Soicety is represented, and thus a presentation library is maintained in perpetuity.

An Ocean Games Service is now being developed along similar lines.

Sometimes we are asked why it is necessary for Societies such as ours to interest ourselves in welfare work when State provision is made to cover the need of seamen requiring help. The answer is simple. State provision is good and in most instances, once in operation, adequate in so far as it goes, but the machinery is inclined to be cumbersome and the virtue of the help we are able to give lies in the fact that it can be both immediate and, providing it is for seamen or their dependants, unlimited in scope.

I should add that the British Sailors' Society, which is supported entirely by voluntary subscription, is an interdenominational missionary Society and, while respecting the individual beliefs of sailors, its purpose is to promote their well-being in body, mind and spirit by demonstrating a practical Christianity.

It touches the sailor at every point in his life. It trains him—for we have an officially recognized sea-training establishment for boys as well as a nautical school for young officers—it houses him, gives him recreation, tends him in his old age and helps his dependents. In short, it labours ceaselessly and devotedly for all that magnificent body of man upon whom the prosperity, indeed the survival, of the British Commonwealth so largely depends.

Dr. Johnson once remarked to his faithful Boswell that "the only difference between sea and prison life was the added chance of being drowned". This is no longer true. The sailor of today is not a prisoner and he has, perhaps, a wider knowledge of the world than his fellow men. He has ambitions and the desire for better conditions and he is entitled, you will agree, to comfort and true friendship when ashore.

We are therefore planning, through our Dominion Council, a great extension of the Society's activities throughout Canada and I feel confident, Mr. President and Gentlemen, that we may count upon the support of the members of the Empire Club of Canada and of all who believe in the Brotherhood of the Sea, in furthering this vital work; and I would mention especially the need at Vancouver where it is essential that there be established at an early date a modern and well-appointed Sailors' Centre worthy of that growing Port, worthy of Canada and, above all, worthy of the Men whom we seek to serve and to whom we, each one of us, are heavily indebted.

In conclusion, Mr. President, and in thanking you for the honour of addressing this company, and for your hospitality to me today, I should like to take this opportunity, since I am shortly returning home, of expressing my gratitude to all those organizations and individuals in the East, in the West and in the Prairies, who have extended such a friendly and warm welcome and who have given me much encouragement in my mission.

I shall take away nothing but thankfulness for the great privilege that has been mine to meet so many good people, coupled with a greater appreciation your vast domain and its tremendous distances, and a sincere admiration of your way of living.

We in the British Isles, as they in the United States, have been strengthened by a mixture of races, but you right here have no lesser claim to the motto "E Pluribus Unum", for it is out of much variety of country and a great multitude of races that you are making Canada great, and *one* . . . While your association in the Commonwealth is such that it is "Fashioned not of parchment, but of men's hearts and minds".

May Canada prosper and be strong, and continue to flourish in the British tradition.

"DOMINION-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HON. THOMAS D. PATTULLO, K.C., LL.D.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, November 21, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air.

As an emergency measure in war time, the Federal Government took over from each of the nine provinces certain fields of taxation. Since the conclusion of the war the question of the resumption of collecting those taxes by the provinces has been a very live issue. I understand three of the provinces have concluded their agreements with Ottawa. The Province of Ontario has not yet done so. This is only one feature our speaker will cover. The platform of this club does not lend itself to political discussions but this question, in respect to this meeting, should under no consideration be viewed in a political sense but rather from the standpoint of interpretation—I might say legal interpretation—of agreements—precedent—and justice to all taxpayers.

Our guest of honour today may truthfully be said to hold a supreme position as an authority on the subject he has chosen. Past Prime Minister of B.C.—a member of the legal profession—a parliamentarian—author—newspaper editor—and a businessman, his activities in many fields have extended all the way from Ontario, the province of his birth and early education, right through Canada to the Yukon where he engaged in business. From his knowledge of the west and his background of the east he may well speak with authority, not only on problems of one section of Canada, but on the problems of Canada as a whole.

Gentlemen—it is my pleasure to re-introduce to an Empire Club audience—the Hon. Thos. D. Pattullo, K.C., LL.D., who's subject is—

"DOMINION PROVINCIAL RELATIONS"

HON. THOMAS D. PATTULLO: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen:-

I appreciate the courtesy of this opportunity to make a few observations.

The innumerable complexities with which we find ourselves surrounded as a consequence of discovery and invention have had profound effect upon our industrial and social regimen and even upon our spiritual thinking.

In considering our problems we cannot dissociate the past from the present, nor the present from the future.

That which each of us does in his own sphere may seem relatively small in relation to the sum total of effort, but, great or small as the effect of our effort may be, it is all a part of the overall pattern which warns us to have a care of all our activities for, if not a sparrow falls without cause and effect, how shall we estimate the atom about which we know so appallingly much and so frighteningly little.

When Adam and Eve were the sole occupants of the good earth it would seem, in modern parlance, that they had the world by the tail, yet there was something lacking. So soon was man's acquisitive propensity in evidence. If two heads are better than one, then it would appear that more than two would be better than two. Our illustrious progenitors apparently had not considered that too many cooks might spoil the broth, but rather that in the multitude of counsel lay wisdom.

The growth of the family necessitated the formulation of rules and regulations for its orderly guidance, notwithstanding which Cain killed Abel, thereby establishing precedent for the gruesome designs of individuals and ultimately the barbarous atrocities of whole peoples.

Meantime we find that the family increased and multiplied until they became tribes. These tribes scattered afar and required further rules and regulations for their guidance and customs were established which finally took the force of law. Then it came to pass that varying conditions brought about varying and various characteristics and these circumstances created prejudices and hard-feelings, because some peoples high-hatted others, while covetous eyes were cast upon each other's possessions.

In course of time the tribes, through further increase of population, developed into nations and hence further laws had to be made for the governance of society, which was ever becoming more complex, so complex that it became necessary to endeavour to fix relationships as between nations.

Experience is a capricious teacher, sometimes tantalizingly slow, at other times embarrassingly fast.

Discovery and invention whirled along as fast as the earth moves and brought forth, amongst other things, new implements and instruments for the destruction of human life. Thus there was provided for the greedy and avaricious the means to accomplish their nefarious purposes. Now we find that the means to create war and destruction must be used to preserve peace and construction.

Not to labor the argument, but rather to suggest something practical as to Canada's position, which has become so increasingly important in world hegemony, it seems clear that we must use our most heroic effort to preserve peace, the while never overlooking the responsibility to fortify ourselves in the means of preserving it. Not only is peace necessary for the preservation of life, but there can be no lasting prosperity without peace.

In preponderant degree Canada is dependent upon foreign trade to maintain her prosperity, but how can we be strong externally if our internal condition is one of disintegrating strife?

At this moment there are two questions of major importance confronting us, namely, that of Dominion-Provincial relations, and Industry and Labour.

The depression which we suffered in the '30s should not have been surprising. Ever since Confederation we had been spending huge sums upon railroad construction. Concurrent with railroad expansion private endeavour was likewise expanding. For many years a vigorous immigration policy was followed which, of itself, created new endeavour and added strength to our national wellbeing. Suddenly railroad expansion ceased; correspondingly, so did private endeavour; immigration was curtailed, while tariff barriers were a detriment to international trade. Is it any wonder that our far-flung Canada, with its sparse population, found itself faced with an aggravated unemployment problem?

During the depression the problem of unemployment became so acute that some of the Provinces found themselves under the necessity of issuing Treasury notes to the Dominion Government.

Ever since Confederation various of the Provinces have felt themselves at disadvantage in the scheme of Confederation and, from time to time, have made representations to the Dominion authority in this regard.

The depression was a powerful factor in bringing matters to a head. In consequence of the many conconsiderations involved the Dominion Government appointed a Royal Commission to study and report upon the whole question of Dominion-Provincial Relations. The Commission engaged in a very exhaustive study and their report constitutes a compendium of useful and valuable information, but, their financial proposals followed the trend that had been in evidence, governmentally in Ottawa, for a considerable time.

Prior to the setting up of the Royal Commission the Dominion had been endeavouring to secure larger control over Provincial finance and conceived the idea of the establishment of a Loan Council to which all Provincial borrowing would be submitted. The argument was that the proposal would make for the orderly marketing of Provincial securities without conflict one with the other.

It was obvious that this procedure would establish in the Dominion a very definite and intimate control of Provincial borrowings, more than they then possessed.

The Provinces did not approve of these proposals.

The unemployment of the depression period has had repercussions of various character upon our people and is still an ominous spectre as to what the future may have in store.

During the depression the Dominion did not appear to have any comprehensive plans to meet the grave situation casued through unemployment. The policy of the Dominion at that time appeared to be to provide only such ways and means as would keep the unemployed physically alive. This policy was devastating in its effects and was not only breaking down the morale of the unemployed, but was causing grave disquiet and concern to all our people.

It is true that to put people to work does, for the moment, cost more in dollars and cents than to feed and shelter them in idleness, but, not to keep people employed is a costly business, both in money and morale.

Dominion expenditure, at the time of the depression, was under one-half billion dollars annually. To put employable unemployed to work upon public undertakings would have cost from 100 to 200 millions more annually, and would have compelled increase in taxation. Ottawa was aghast at such proposals. It was preposterous to think of anything of the kind and so we continued to drift upon the cold, gray rocks of unemployment.

Dominion expenditures have, since that time, reached ten times the amount then spent and our people have been persuaded that we can readily carry the obligations which we have since assumed, but, time marches on and World War No. II took us out of a depression, just as had World War I.

During World War II and following submission of the Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, the Dominion called a Dominion-Provincial Conference in 1941.

The exigencies of the War were designated as the reason for the calling of the Conference at that time, but, the financial proposals were of permanent and, in practicality, of irrevocable character, namely, the surrender to the Dominion of exclusive jurisdiction in Income and Corporation Tax and Succession Duties.

Without reference to the Provinces the Dominion prepared an agenda for the Conference. This agenda provided for the appointment of Committees, one of which was a Finance Committee. The only term of reference to this Committee, as proposed in the agenda, was Plan I of the Royal Commission Report, under which the Income and Corporation Tax and Succession Duties were to be placed in the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion.

Contrary to reports which were circulated all across Canada, that three nefarious persons representing three of the Provinces, had sabotaged the Conference, all of the Provinces were anxious to proceed with discussion of all questions at interest between the Dominion and the Provinces, but, the Dominion refused to depart from the terms of their own agenda and, consequently, three of the Provinces would not proceed upon that basis.

You will, perhaps, better appreciate the Provincial position by illustration.

British Columbia first imposed the Income Tax in 1876 and our financial economy had largely been built upon it. Ottawa did not levy Income Tax until 1918. The Minister of Finance of that date expressed regret at the necessity which was caused through the exigencies of World War No. I.

The Dominion collection at first was less than that of the Province, but, gradually increased until it has reached its present major proportions.

The last Provincial levy, in 1940-41, brought in some 12 million dollars, and the last Dominion collection was approximately 160 million dollars.

At the time of Confederation it was not thought that it would be necessary for the Dominion to enter the Income Tax field, but, it was definitely anticipated that the Provinces might be compelled to do so in order to carry out the responsibilities placed upon them under the British North America Act, hence, the Provinces were specifically vested with authority to impose direct taxation.

In adjusting this portentious issue there is one thing to be borne in mind, namely, that if the British North America Act is amended so as to place the Income Tax field within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion such action would be irrevocable. We must not overlook this.

In my opinion the Provinces would be improvident, indeed, if they ever surrendered the Income Tax field to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion. Nor does there appear necessity for taking a so drastic course. It should be recognized that in a country as far flung as Canada single yardstick cannot measure the requirements of each economic unit of the Dominion and it would seem the part of prudence that each of the Provinces should be so placed as to enable it to carry out its responsibilities in confederation.

Periodically each of the Provinces should have opportunity for revision of its position in the general economy, but to suggest that the Dominion economy should be so weighted that each Province must conform to the general average of all would be equivalent to saying that of a family of nine no one member shall rise above the general average of all, which, as Euclid would say, is absurd.

To be specific, in the present situation I suggest that Ottawa should abandon its insistence upon securing exclusive jurisdiction in the Income Tax field. That it enter into agreements with the Provinces for a limited period for the exclusive levy of Income and Corporation Tax and Succession Duties with payment to the Provinces of such sums as may be agreed upon in lieu thereof. During the interval of the ensuing period no time should be lost in endeavouring to reach a more permanent basis.

To ensure this end the Dominion should undertake to assume its proper responsibility in the unemployment problem. It should also make clear its position in respect of various social and welfare problems. It should agree to co-operate with the Provinces in clarification and confirmation in certain other considerations. With these matters adjusted, I suggest that the Dominion be given exclusive jurisdiction in the levy of Succession Duties. Thereafter there should be periodic adjustments of amounts to be paid to the Provinces in lieu of Income Tax, but, the Provinces should not abrogate their rights of jurisdiction in the Income Tax field. The Dominion did not exercise its authority to levy Income Tax from 1867 to 1918, but there was no abrogation of its authority to do so.

It is possible that the proposals which I have made may not receive unalloyed approbation, nevertheless some common ground must be reached. Conditions dictate that there should be ever increasing co-operation between the Provinces and the Dominion. To achieve this there must be a mutual spirit of goodwill.

NOW THE LABOUR QUESTION

From the manifestations which have taken place over the past year, one must view with alarm the relationship of Labour and Industry. Is it going too far to say that we are in the midst of a period of gangsterdom, and we, the people, have permitted a situation to develop, the end of which appears, to say the least, disquieting?

It was my fortune for many years to take part in Labour and Social Welfare matters in the Province of British Columbia. I think it may be said that our Province was considerably in advance of other portions of Canada, as well as the United States, in this regard. At all events, I may say that I was told many times by financial men in this City of Toronto and elsewhere, that we were going too fast in our Labour and Welfare legislation and were setting a bad example to the rest of the country. I did not then, nor do I now, think so.

I think that the country, as a whole, has allowed labour problems to get out of hand. We have followed a course of shallow expediency and we have allowed ourselves to drift into very dangerous waters.

Internationally we are trying to outlaw war and to create an organization which will be able to avert war, yet, we cannot keep the peace within our own territory and we permit single units to set up and gravely embarrass the daily economy of our lives, because we have not taken definite action to prevent such occurrences.

Experience has taught us that, for the general and individual welfare of society, certain prohibitions and restraints are necessary.

Is it not perfectly obvious, in respect of Industry-Labour relations, that codes must be formulated for the maintenance of the orderly processes of living? I suggest that it is and that these codes must be mandatory.

Generally speaking, I think that neither Industry nor Labour has heretofore favoured compulsory measures; that is, compulsory legal measures. Both have thought that they would probably get the best of the deal by leaving the problem wide open.

One of the obstacles in the way of agreement upon procedure has been the distrust by both Labour and Capital in such procedure as might be established.

It seems to me that events have been such as to crystalize the situation pretty clearly. Nevertheless I am not sure that the lessons which the present conditions teach are yet fully appreciated. Is it not evident that the kind of negotiations which have proceeded, and adjustments which have been made, are only stopgaps and that something more fundamental is essential if we are to avoid continual disruptions in the production of essential goods and services?

I suggest that the strike and the picket should be outlawed. That Boards of Arbitration should be established in the various Provinces, with a Board of Appeal of Dominion-wide character. This, of course, would necessitate co-operation between the Dominion and the Provinces.

I suggest that responsibilities of Labour organizations should be fixed as well as those of employers. That both employer and employees must abide by the awards of arbitration. Appropriate penalties should be provided for breach of award.

I am not unmindful of the many factors that must be taken into consideration in making this legislation effective. Many people argue that you cannot compel men to work if they do not want to do so. I say, yes, that you can do so, without curtailment of legitimate personal liberty. There should be more doing of those things which we ought to do and less doing of those things which we ought not to do. The kind of thing to which we have been submitting constitutes conspiracy to achieve ends by the unlawful use of force.

Our statute books must contain laws to preclude force in the settlement of disputes, and that includes the strike and the picket, for they both involve the use of force. The only time that physical force should be used is to enforce the law.

Our Legislators generally reflect public opinion and they have been timid in action just as public opinion has been timid. Fear is a fearful foe.

From long experience in public life, I would say that the quality most lacking in our public life is courage, and this lack of courage is probably largely superinduced by fear of what the people back home will think, or fear of what a powerful minority may do,—for a powerful minority is often more effective in action than a complacent majority.

In a nutshell, one thing we must do—we must keep goods and services moving in orderly and profitable fashion.

If I have seemed to over simplify the problems which I have presented, I am not unmindful that we must be unflinching in our purposes and equally unflinching in carrying them out. The more timid orderly purpose is, the more ruthless sinister purpose becomes.

As we are now drifting we are, at one and the same time, necessitating and facilitating extreme action of drastic and regrettable character.

Notwithstanding untoward conditions, we must never lose heart.

When precedent is good let us follow it. When precedent is bad let us junk it, and when it is desirable to create precedent, let us resolutely do so.

In spite of so many seeming contradictions I refuse to believe that the world is going to the dogs. It is true that we have been passing through a disgraceful episode in the life of one of the meaner planets, but I believe that man who has transcended such heights and fathomed such depths, is not en-route to extinction, but to greater glorification.

"CANADA'S PARTNERSHIP IN FREEDOM"

AN ADDRESS BY

PROFESSOR REGINALD G. TROTTER
M.A., Ph.D., D.C.L.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, November 28, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air.

"Today, in the united effort of many peoples, welded by war into the United Nations, to build a more free and more secure world, the Commonwealth of British Nations holds a place of unique influence and responsibility. In defending our freedom, Canadians have become linked more strongly than ever with all the British peoples and with all other peoples who cherish freedom and whose hearts are strong in its defence".

That paragraph, gentlemen, I am quoting from a book—just off the press—entitled "Charters of Our Freedom"—the author of which is our guest of honour today. A most interesting and authoritative book beginning with the Magna Carta and tracing the steps over many hundreds of years by which our freedom was achieved, down to the present day. No one is more capable of this brilliant analytical treatise and chronicle on the question of civil and political liberty than our guest speaker today.

Reginald Trotter was born at Woodstock, Ontario, but spent most of his boyhood in Nova Scotia. His university studies were at Acadia—McMaster—Yale and Harvard. For the past twelve years he has been head of the Department of History—Queen's U., holding the James Douglas' professorship of Canadian and Colonial History. In 1945 he was a delegate to the British Commonwealth Relations Conference in London. Prof. Trotter is a fellow of the Royal Historical Society and also of the Royal Society of Canada past president of the Canadian Historical Association and chairman of the Canadian Social Science Research Committee. It is my privilege to introduce this eminent lecturer and author —Prof. Reg. G. Trotter, M.A., Ph.D., D.C.L., Fellow Royal Historical Society, Fellow Royal Society of Canada whose subject is—

"CANADA'S PARTNERSHIP IN FREEDOM"

Professor Trotter.

PROF. R. G. TROTTER: I am happy to be here today. The very name of your organization, "The Empire Club of Canada," suggests that this is a peculiarly appropriate audience to which to address remarks on "Canada's Partnership in Freedom." For you are especially interested in Canada, and you are also especially interested in that Empire within which Canada grew to free nationhood, that Empire which has become a Commonwealth of free nations setting today an example of partnership unique among the nations of the world. Your special interest in Canada and in the Empire indicate, too, the strength of your interest in the cause of freedom.

The world has just been through an ordeal by battle in which the central issue at stake was the very survival of freedom anywhere. And today all free peoples are obviously still faced by the fundamental problem of how to order affairs within their borders and their relations with others in such a way that freedom may endure. In our generation we have watched many peoples who seemed well on the road to freedom give ear to false prophets and lose their way. Others we have seen overwhelmed by the forces of despotism. By virtue of victory, freedom survives and opportunity continues for its growth, but we are compelled to recognize now, if we did not recognize it before, that the growth of freedom and even its survival are not to be taken for granted. Freedom has no automatic permanence anywhere. Its tenure on life is always precarious. If we would preserve it, even for ourselves, we must not only be ready in a crisis to defend it; we must take thought concerning it, see it for what it is, and recognize the conditions necessary for its survival.

Much discussion of freedom is properly given to trying to define the margines between freedom and despotism on the one hand, and between freedom and anarchy on the other. It is obvious that in a genuinely free society there must be effective authority acting in the general interest and restraining individuals from conduct that would impair the freedom and the welfare of their fellows. But the proper scope of authority and the proper limits on the individual are difficult to define. These lines are hard to draw whether we think in terms of the civil rights of the individual or of his political rights. They are hard enough to draw in the abstract. It is harder still to relate them effectively to the complication of actual living. Difficulty is further increased today by the rapidity of the changes taking place in modern society, in our own state, and in the world at large, which make it practically impossible to keep law and practice up to date. Law-making, policy-making, and administration trail behind the actual needs and conditions of the day. That is to some degree inevitable. One result, and a wholesome result, is that much discussion of our institutions of freedom is critical, it concentrates on shortcomings. Often, however, and unfortunately, it centres so completely on the contrasts between the perfection of the ideal and the imperfections of the actual, that it neglects the positive values of the freedom that we do enjoy till these tend to drop out of sight and sometimes seem to be forgotten. Free discussion is a fundamental necessity of a free society, but its opportunity is only partly used if we confine attention to the shortcomings of our institutions and our traditions. We need also to give thoughtful attention to their positive values. It is by these that they should be measured as well as against ideals of perfection. For improvement will most surely be made by using these as foundations so far as we can, not by seeking their destruction. The best friends of freedom in our society are not those who would destroy all that is short of perfection but those who would cherish what we have that is good and build on it to make it better. What have we then, in our existing system, to give up hope that we can maintain our freedom and build it larger in the future? How did we come by the freedom that we have? What conditions must be met if we would preserve it? What opportunities and responsibilities does Canada's freedom involve for Canadians? These are large questions for a short talk, altogether too large to cover completely, but may I touch briefly on a few matters that such questions suggest?

We start with our awareness today that we must be much more concerned about freedom than most of us were only a few years ago, when we took for granted that freedom was our own sure and permanent possession and when we were confident of its continuing increase in the world at large; when, therefore, it did not seem to matter whether or not we were confused in our thinking about it, or whether we even thought about it at all. It was better, generally we assumed, to give our attention to more pressing problems. So we let ourselves remain confused about the nature of the citizen's freedom within the state and also about the free position of our nation in the world and the conditions on which its existence and growth depended.

As for freedom of the individual, was it not perhaps the case in those days that we too easily and too often acted on the assumption that it was to be measured merely in terms of immunity from restrictions upon individual conduct and from any more than nominal obligations to the state? We have learned by hard experience in our crisis of national survival that the necessary responsibilities of the citizen to his fellow-citizens and to state set sharp limits to his individual freedom of action and may impose upon him arduous duties and heavy obligations. It was obvious in the crisis of war that the common good, your good and my good alike, required that we work together and sacrifice together if there was to remain for each of us the essential freedom that we cherish. This sort of truth has been made so clear during our recent ordeal for freedom, that we are never likely to go back all the way in our individual relations within our own national community to the old principle of "each for himself and the devil take the hindmost."

In those old days did we not also sometimes fall short of salutary realism in thinking about our freedom as a nation? Sometimes we talked as if it's fullness and security could best be attained by isolating Canada, apparently on the assumption that national freedom was synonomous with utter independence from everybody else. The attainment of independence, in man or nation, is of course thoroughly wholesome when it means out-growing and abandoning dependence upon others for what one becomes able to do and ought to do for himself, but it is hardly a wholesome evidence of maturity if it expresses itself in a determination to be freer than ever of responsibility. In the years between the wars it was, in my belief, wholesome that the independence of our national status should be more definitely established than it had been in earlier years. But sometimes that necessity of our growth seemed to bring perverse consequences, when there appeared an unwholesome tendency to try to use independence merely as a means of attaining a national position that should be quite irresponsible. Once we had secured full recognition of national status, not only in the British Commonwealth but also in the League of Nations and finally by the United States, it seemed to be our chief care to whittle away formal commitments and to repudiate any idea that obligations might exist in any direction. Sometimes we seemed determined to take advantage of the recognition of our independence in order to establish in reality a new and quite irresponsible dependence. But growing crisis shocked us into realism, and then this line of argument proved to have been only superficial dreaming. We proceeded to demonstrate that it was as false to our national ideals as it was inconsistent with our vital interests. We were quick, by our own action, to assume a full national share in meeting the crisis; however we may have talked beforehand, we acted now not on principles of isolation and irresponsibility but on principles of interdependence and responsibility. After that experience with reality we as a nation are henceforth no more likely to forget that these principles of interdependence and responsibility are basic to national freedom than we are likely to forget that the individual citizen can enjoy genuine rights only as he recognizes that obligations to his fellow citizens are basic to free citizenship in a free community.

There is no need for me here to dwell on Canada's war effort, by whose character and scale we demonstrated how misleading had really been our apparent waverings and negative uncertainties of the years between the wars. But it is pertinent for me to remind you of certain inescapable and highly significant facts. At the beginning, Canada was among that small group of nations which by their own positive action took their stand in 1939 shoulder to shoulder in the active ranks of the fighters in the cause of freedom. When the western democracies on the European continent were overrun in 1940 we were not among those on the side-lines, who thought that the battle was lost; rather, as Britain's most powerful associate in the conflict for many months after the fall of France, we stuck to our guns and redoubled our national effort. Throughout the war we proved ourselves ready to co-operate more widely and more intimately than ever in the past with our partners in the Commonwealth, among them most of all the United Kingdom, also with our next-door neighbour the United States and, as time went on, with other nations as well. It was in these partnerships from the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan and the Canada-United States Joint Board on Defense to the operations of our forces in integral association with others on every front, and in various economic aspects of the war effort, that we found opportunity to demonstrate that we had really come of age.

The importance of our active partnership with others in the war and the scale and the quality of the goods and the armed effort which were our contribution, brought to Canada full and worldwide recognition as a nation of considerable account in the world. It was no supersensitive assertions of status or isolationist stand-offishness that brought this recognition, but practical achievement and attention to the job in hand and unexcelled readiness for active partnership with others all along the line, wherever it could strengthen the cause in which victory was essential if freedom for men and nations was to survive and still find opportunity to grow. Of course in working out the details of co-operation in various directions there were sometimes new questions of definition to be dealt with and adjustments to be made, but these were incidental matters. Certainly it was not by standing on technical details that Canada won the recognition of her stature that the world now gives her. It was the weight of our cooperation and its wholeheartedness that woke the world to the actualities of our national position, a position of genuine independence, but a kind of independence unusually consistent with attitudes and practices of partnership.

The obvious general recognition of Canada's strength and acknowledgment of the reality of her position among the nations has perhaps done more than anything else to dispel among Canadians themselves the remaining vestiges of uncertain self-depreciation and any surviving lack of adequate self-respect. Like our musicians and our writers and our artists, of whose rank we have often been convinced only after the outside world has recognised them, so our national position has acquired increased respectability in Canadian eyes now that it has so fully received recognition in the outside world. We are now set at ease about ourselves and are therefore no longer really bothered when, for example, some outsider, friendly or otherwise, asks why we remain in bondage under a royal despotism. There is now hardly a Canadian left who does not feel that to such a demonstration of political illiteracy the appropriate reaction is not sensitiveness or annoyance but rather superiority, perhaps tempered with sympathy. The fact that our institutions are not just like those of our neighbours but are our own and are ours by our own choice, becomes a mark of distinction and a source of pride. We can be confident now that we best serve ourselves, our partners in the Commonwealth, yes, and the true interest of our great republican neighbour and the world of nations, by being ourselves, frankly, unashamedly, even, if you like, with decent pride. We are most truly free when we are thus ourselves, not when we would try, as there have sometimes been Canadians who would have us try, to obscure our distinguishing qualities behind a mask of subserviency and sycophancy in order to present to an alien observer as nearly as possible a reflected image of himself.

What, then, are our distinguishing qualities as a nation? What is it, particularly, that has enabled Canada to contribute as remarkably as she has done to the security and the progress of a free world? Many things would enter into a complete answer to that question, but you will agree with me that one important factor is to be found in the peculiarities of our particular brand of freedom. The peculiar and essential fact in Canada's national freedom is that it has been obtained in a way that did not involve the delusion that national independence is necessarily synonymous with isolation. Despite our frequent emphasis in pre-war years on the negative aspects of defining our status we never actually repudiated the tradition of community and interdependence within which our nation had achieved its maturity. The process of growing up involved, it is quite true, putting an end to colonial subordination to imperial authority, in our case by agreement and collaboration with the Imperial Government but that has been only one aspect of our historical relation to the Empire. More significant than the need of the transforming subordinate to equal status has been the fact through the years that the Empire was for us a framework in which the institutions and the spirit of freedom were so inherent and so strong that they insured their growth in Canada and the eventual development of Canada to national maturity.

In the process of growth to free nationhood Canada certainly herself made important, indeed essential, contributions. But of course to this audience it does not need to be pointed out that no Canadian conversant with his country's history would claim that by ourselves we invented freedom. Yet, as you are well aware, among the popular delusions that have not yet wholly died on this continent is the delusion that freedom was invented in the New World. As a matter of fact our own country, and the United States no less, owe their traditions of freedom, both personal and political, and the fruition of those traditions in their national independence as two free societies living side by side, to the heritage of freedom which was brought across the Atlantic in the early days of English colonization and became established in the old English colonies to a degree unique in history, long before some of them broke away and became the United States. It is quite true that conditions of life in our New World frontiers of settlements have done much to mould the pattern of democracy as it exists on this continent, but the basic principles of its design were imported. If North American democracy could be explained merely by the presence of frontier conditions, what about other great frontier regions which were settled in the same era, such, to cite a single example, as Siberia? It is, to say the least, a curious coincidence that those frontiers settled from Europe where free institutions have flourished have been preeminently, if not exclusively, in regions now comprised in the United States and in the British Dominions, and it must not be overlooked that most of these dominions became the free nations that they are, while they were still so remote in every way from the United States and its particular form of democratic experiment that their democracy can certainly not be attributed to American example. In the growth of Canadian democracy the influence of frontier conditions similar to those in the United States, and even the influence of American example, have been incidental compared to the more fundamental fact that we, like the Americans, and like the peoples of the other dominions, are heirs of a free tradition.

It is a point worth further emphasis that the large and fortunate community of life and outlook which we as Canadians enjoy with the American nation is not primarily because we live side by side and have many dealings with one another. These circumstances facilitate our contacts and intercourse but many nations which are close neighbours in the physical sense are far less alike than we are and enjoy far less mutual good will. Much more important for us is our historical community of traditions and institutions and ideals within which we both live. Our American friends may have repudiated the Empire by the manner in which they asserted their independence, but in so far as they have sometimes tended in later years to identify their liberty with antagonism to Britain, that is a perverse tradition, for in fact they built their constitutions, federal and state, and they shaped their bills of rights, basically on older English models and they built representative government in their republic on their own long colonial experience with free institutions as colonies in the old Empire. In short the roots of their freedom and the roots of freedom in our own land and throughout the British Commonwealth are very much the same.

Those roots go farther back than even to those days when early British colonists and the governments and commercial companies that sponsored their settlements took for granted that personal freedom and some degree of representative government should characterize the new colonies. Colonial self-government in those early days was decidedly limited but it took root quickly and grew vigorously. That it existed at all, and still more that it grew as it did, are phenomena which we tend so much to take for granted that we sometimes forget that they were unique. To see it in true perspective one need merely notice the contrast between British practice and that of other early colonial powers, in whose systems there was nothing of the sort. The contrast is easily explained. England had the good fortune, even in the Middle Ages, to be able to establish legal safeguards of personal liberty and to place limits on Royal power by developing a representative parliament to a degree that on the continent it had proved impossible to establish or maintain. All the peoples of Western Europe were co-heirs of the ancient world where Hebrew, Greek and Roman had all contributed to the foundations of Western Civilization. Many of our ideas of law and government come from those early Mediterranean peoples. But through long vicissitudes of history, when in most countries the ancient roots of freedom withered, England, perhaps partly because of her protecting moat of narrow seas, proved able to assert early the principle that the law is above even the king, and was also able through the centuries to enlarge and make more firm the freedom of her people. Liberty of the subject under laws that restrain not only his fellow citizens but his rulers from violation of his freedom, has been a growing pinciple of English law for more than seven centuries since that famous encounter at Runnymede beside the Thames when Anglo-Norman barons and clergy wrested Magna Carta from a reluctant King John. For almost as long, the influence of the people through parliament, in making laws, in authorizing taxes, and in choosing and rejecting rulers, has been growing with little intermission, till today the British system of government is as free, as flexible, as responsive to the national will and at the same time as stable as any democratic system in the world. In some respects, indeed, it is pre-eminent.

Another element of the freedom that is our heritage, which began to show itself very early in the British story, was the spirit of tolerance toward diverse group traditions within the state. There is a long and sometimes troubled story behind the fact that the United Kingdom itself is today a union of nationalities in which diversity is not only tolerated but fostered. The growth of this tradition with the British state itself helps unquestionably to explain the unique degree to which the history of the overseas Empire has been marked so largely as it has been by tolerance and indeed encouragement of local diversity and by increasing promotion of the growth of Colonial self-government. In the area that is now Canada, even before the American Revolution, such principles were established. Quebec was then without representative government such as had begun already to function, if somewhat imperfectly, in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but in Quebec a great and unprecedented departure was made by Parliament in the Quebec Act, guaranteeing to the French Canadians the preservation under law of their own way of life.

I have said enough to remind you that while Canada is today significantly a partner for freedom with numerous other nations in various forms of partnership, the strength of her hold on freedom also grows out of her partnership with the past. She is peculiarly fortunate that the form of her independence and the manner in which it was attained have not meant denying the interdependence of her freedom with that of other nations today or forgetting the continuity of her freedom with its historic origins. In some countries, pyschological obstacles created by such denials and forgettings stand in the way of forming easily those voluntary and close partnerships with other nations such as all free nations must somehow secure and maintain. That we in Canada labour so little under difficulties of this sort is not so much to our credit as it is our good fortune. Here is a case where what has sometimes been deplored as an unfortunate time-lag in Canadian development compared with that of the United States actually worked out to our advantage. For us the growth to national independence, to full national stature, did not come till Britain herself had so enlarged and matured her own institutions of freedom, and had so developed the ideals by which they worked, that the adjustments which change our former colonial relationship to our present equal partnership could be made by mutual agreement and by common action. Thus Canada was born into a world that needs a full sense of comradeship among the nations, with the good fortune that she had attained her own national maturity within a framework of interdependence and by virtue of it, rather than by denying this principle which must today be the cornerstone of freedom.

In a perilous world, much of it far from free, we may well be thankful as Canadians for our especially rich heritage of freedom and for the many links which unite us in interdependence with all those who cherish freedom for men and for nations. But we can rightly be proud of that heritage only if we continue to hold to its ideals and still shoulder eagerly our share of the responsibilities that they entail. True pride in our own freedom today means pride in our past. Our special heritage as a free partner in the British Commonwealth gives us a peculiar opportunity and makes it our high duty to combat the delusion, wherever it may survive, that freedom within the state or among the nations can live by policies of isolation and by evasion or denial of responsibilities. Our Canadian heritage challenges us to stand ever for the ideal of partnership in freedom, to work from day to day with all who are freedom's builders, and to march shoulder to shoulder with those who have the vision and the will and the courage to be its defenders.

"THE ROYAL SOCIETY EMPIRE SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE"

England, 1946

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. ELWOOD S. MOORE, Ph.D., M.A.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, December 5, 1946

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air—Since the inception of this Club forty-three years ago, we have welcomed to this platform many men of world renown who have shared with us their knowledge and wisdom on a great variety of subjects. With some our patriotic fervor has been aroused and the significance of our motto—"Canada and a United Empire"—has been brought home to us with forcefulness and with eloquence. With others we have looked at our own country and its resources with awakened interest. On other occasions we have visited foreign lands and learned something of their attributes and their problems. In fact, it may be said that our speakers have been drawn from that field of eminent men throughout the world who have a message for us in respect to world affairs at large or matters of more immediate interest in our own country. Our guest speaker today is recognized as an authority in the field of geological science and is the head of that department at the U. of T.—so be prepared for the best—or maybe should I say, the worst—for he may take us into the mines of Canada or we may find ourselves ascending with him into the realm beyond the stratosphere. In either event I trust he will bring us safely back so this meeting may be concluded at the accustomed time.

We are proud to say that Dr. Moore is a native of this province, and a brilliant graduate from our own U. of T., receiving his B.A. in 1904, his M.A. in 1908 and Ph.D. at the U. of Chicago in 1909. In 1922 he was appointed Prof. of Geology at the U. of T. and also a director of the Royal Ontario Museum of Geology. He studied in Paris, France, and later in Hawaii, Australia, New Zealand, India and parts of Europe. He has been selected many times to carry out important geological surveys and is the author of numerous papers and books on scientific subjects. Dr. Moore attended the Royal Society Empire Scientific Conference, held in England last June and July and it is about that conference that we will learn today. It is my privilege to introduce to you

DR. ELWOOD S. MOORE, Ph.D., M.A.

Dr. Moore.

DR. ELWOOD S. MOORE: Nature and Objects of the Conference. This Conference was organized by the Royal Society of London, with the support of the British government, to bring together scientists from various parts of the Empire. The delegations were composed of men working in the physical and biological sciences. The social and political sciences were not involved since they are not included in the Royal Society and, I suppose, they are likely to provoke too much controversy.

The delegates were chosen to represent the national scientific societies, research institutions, universities, and federal and colonial government bureaus and departments. The appointment of Canadians finally rested with our Department of External Affairs which assumed responsibility for sending them to England and arranging priorities for travel. All delegates were the guests of the Royal Society of London while in England and they were the recipients of generous hospitality.

Canada sent fifteen delegates and Dr. C. J. Mackenzie, President of the National Research Council, served as leader of the delegation. Most of the physical and biological sciences were represented as well as the federal Department of Mines and Resources, and Agriculture. I had the honour, as President of the Royal Society of Canada, of representing that organization and the geological sciences.

The United Kingdom had much the largest delegation, composed of many of the most eminent scientists of the nation. It should be said to their great credit that they did not show any tendency to dominate the Conference. Canada came second, India third, with fourteen delegates. Australia, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, New Zealand, The West Indies, East Africa, Palestine, Eire, Burma, Nigeria, Ceylon, Gold Coast, Trinidad, Sierra Leone and Hong Kong sent from eight to one delegate each. There were one hundred and thirteen delegates in all, so the various parts of the Commonwealth and Empire were well represented.

The Royal Society of London had for some time been seized with the idea that the advances in science during the war had been so great that every effort should be made to see that the Empire should not lag behind any other part of the world. It was realized that modern science would play a dominant role in the defence of our peoples, if war should come again, and in industry during the years of peace.

So much importance was attached to this Conference that His Majesty the King opened it with an address delivered in person. The Queen and other members of the Royal Family were present, and Their Majesties graciously received the delegates following the opening session. The response to the King's address and message of welcome was made by Dr. Mackenzie, leader of the Canadian delegation, and it was regarded by all as a delightfully appropriate and masterly reply.

We marveled at the courage of the British scientists in staging such an elaborate conference after what the country had suffered during the war. They said, however, that they felt the great importance of laying plans for the development of new methods in science and the application of all useful scientific knowledge to our industrial and social problems. Further, they were hungry for an opportunity to meet their colleagues from distant parts of the Empire after so much isolation resulting from the war. They wanted to find out what they were doing in research work and make plans for co-operation in the future.

It must be confessed that many of us, before reaching England, had grave misgivings about the success of such a conference. We expected to find the people in the Old Land depressed, handicapped, and in no fit state to make such a big effort as this gathering would demand. We were afraid that the meetings, like some of the United Nations or the Big Four on peace proposals, would end in much talk, considerable controversy, and not much to show in the way of results. It did not take long, however, to see that the Anglo-Saxon genius for organization had been operating and there was a fine, keen and serious spirit of cooperation evident among all delegates. The Royal Society of London had been working for a couple of years on plans and a tremendous amount of "spade" work had been done. This resulted in a well-organized programme and everything went along smoothly. It was generally felt, when the Conference was over, that it had been a great success and it was believed that much good would be derived from it. The Royal Society wields a great influence in high places in the United Kingdom. One can not but see the difference between its influence over there and that of our leading scientific societies on this side of the ocean in matters of public policy. It is recognized, of course, that the Society has about three hundred years of tradition to back it up, and it has numbered among its members the greatest galaxy of scientists that the world has known. Men like Newton, Faraday, Rutherford, Bragg, Darwin and scores of others who have been world figures in science have given it great prestige.

WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

The Scientific Conference lasted three weeks, June 17-July 8, 1946 with meetings running through most days and discussion groups in the evenings. It was followed by the Official Conference, which lasted two weeks and considered the resolutions submittted by the scientists, approving or rejecting them.

We met in London for the first week, Cambridge for the second and at Oxford for nearly a week. We then returned to London for the last few days and the conclusion of our meetings. We were greatly impressed by almost complete lack of bomb damage in Cambridge and Oxford after what we had seen in London and elsewhere. The delegates lived in the residences of the famous old colleges in the two university cities and it was quite an experience for those who did this for the first time.

The universities had not up to that time experienced such a tremendous influx of students as we have in Canada. The Principal of the University of London was complaining that he would have to find space for 12,000 to 13,000 students. I had heard that the University of London consisted of thirty-three divisions and I remarked that he had thirty-three places in which to put his students while at the University of Toronto we expected 17,000 students in two places. He replied that as a matter of fact he had forty-eight places for his students but still they would be crowded.

One English delegate stated that they expected the number of universities in the United Kingdom to double in a few years. The government appropriated 9,000,000 pounds for the support of the universities this year and it costs from 350 to 400 pounds, including capital costs, for each science student per annum. Nevertheless the public is convinced that if the country is to survive, they must continue to give, as they have for several hundred years, their more promising men the best possible training in science.

A great variety of topics were discussed at the Conference, especially those concerned with fundamental research in all branches of science and the applications of science to industry. At the start, reports were presented on the facilities for scientific research existing in various parts of the Empire and the need for improving those facilities. It was shown that Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and South Africa had established National Research Councils or their equivalent on a similar basis. These enjoy a large measure of independence of political control under their respective governments. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in the

United Kingdom is, as pointed out by Sir Henry Tizard, under the control of the King's Privy Council and its operations need not be confined to the United Kingdom. They even, at one time, spent money in Germany where they got foreign scientists to do some work they needed done. There was very litttle public interest in scientific research in England during the latter part of last century. Lord Haldane stirred things up because of what he found in Germany and the danger that Britain would find herself overwhelmed in industry and war by Germany with her application of modern scientific methods. The Royal Society sponsored the research laboratories which have since been taken under the wing of the government and are known as the National Physical Laboratory. Aeronautical research was started and, as we know, paid large dividends during the last war.

There is a peculiar situation in Britain. Most of the great fundamental discoveries in physical science were made there. Sir Isaac Newton was widely acclaimed last summer, during the celebration of the three-hundredth anniversary of his birth, by scientists from nearly all lands, as still the greatest scientist who ever lived. One could name a string of his successors who made great discoveries. Newton is known as the "Father of Optics" and yet the Germans developed the optical industry. The chemistry of dyes was worked out in England but the Germans developed the dye industry far beyond anyone else. As one English scientist remarked to me "they make the great discoveries here and then leave them to the Germans, Americans or someone else to make millions from them."

In some Empire countries, there has been a tendency to place all research work under government-controlled institutes. This was regarded by the Conference as a great mistake. It was considered that all research institutes, councils, or whatever they be called, should be closely linked up with the universities on the one hand and with industry on the other. It was believed that the responsibility for most of what is called fundamental research should be left with the universities, and industrial or applied research, which often concerns special problems, can be taken care of by industry, the research councils and similar organizations.

While listening to the reports on research work being done in various parts of the Empire one took considerable pride in our situation in Canada. Our National Research Council seemed to be organized and operated in a sound manner. Its co-operation with the universities, industry, and our armed forces seemed to be of the approved type. It was said that more money was being spent in Canada, per capita, on agricultural research than in any other country in the world. Sir Thomas Holland, a prominent British scientist, who, for years has worked very hard in the interest of better mineral statistics, stated that Canada was the only member of the Empire producing anything like satisfactory records. It was pointed out that during the war the lack of proper information on the location, resources, production, and quality of mineral substances in the far flung parts of the Empire was woefully lacking. This was a great handicap in war, and it is also a handicap to commerce and industry in peace. It was recommended that the Imperial Institute in London, which was set up to serve as a clearing house for information on the resources of the Empire, and which has slumped in its activities for lack of funds, be reorganized. It could serve for the collection and publication of statistics and as an aid to those countries which have few experts, or laboratories capable of testing many natural products.

Some of the dominions lamented their lack of facilities for training men for the doctor's degree in science and provision for research work that must accompany this training. In New Zealand and Australia, all their most promising men go to other countries for this training and most of them remain abroad. Canada is well advanced in this respect and the opportunities offered serve as a great stimulus to our ambitious young people.

The wisdom of maintaining, in peace time, scientific liaison offices in various centres, such as those in London, Washington, Ottawa and other capitals, which proved so valuable during the war, came in for much discussion. It was agreed that they could do much in furnishing information to workers in various parts of the Empire on what was going on in the countries in which the offices were located. They could be of great assistance in bringing about cooperation among those working on the same or similar problems by exchange of data.

The need for greatly expanded research in medicine was strongly urged. Tropical diseases, and infectious diseases of all kinds, must be brought under better control since all parts of the world are now within such easy reach of one another. Plant diseases and other hazards to agriculture received attention; the conservation of soils, and the best utilization of farm lands in the interests of our populations. A greatly expanded meteorological service to cover the Empire is of much importance to agriculture as well as to commerce and travel. The utilization of raw materials from different parts of the Empire in the chemical industries was given much consideration.

Resolutions were passed favouring further research on the modern methods of mapping by use of radar and other means. They are beginning to remap the United Kingdom on a larger scale than was ever done before. Some of us visited the airdrome at Benson where they have 20,000,000 photograhs and they can find any one of them they want in between two and five minutes. Maps are being drawn from many of these. A greatly expanded operation in making topographic and geological maps of the colonies was recommended.

A matter of much interest to scientists, especially the younger men, is that of exchange of research workers between different institutions. It is surprising how many impediments there are when exchanges are planned. The question of salaries, monetary exchange rates, pensions, income taxes, etc. all crop up. It was decided that something must be done to facilitate exchanges of personnel.

Means were considered for making available to all research workers the vast amount of data in scientific publications of which there are 36,000 in the world. Indexing is a gigantic task but the Farm Bureaus, of which I believe there are twelve, have developed an excellent system although they had none thirty-five years ago.

The subjects mentioned are only part of those taken up at the Conference but they serve to show its scope.

The scientific discussions were interspersed with visits to many laboratories, plants, and experimental farms. One of the most interesting of these trips was to the great Telecommunications Research Establishment at Great Malvern. There were also numerous social functions such as the King's Garden Party, excursions through the Cotswolds, around the harbour of London; teas, receptions and other functions provided by the government, the universities, clubs, societies, and individuals. For all this generous hospitality the delegates were very appreciative.

THE OFFICIAL CONFERENCE

The numerous resolutions adopted by the Scientific Conference were passed on to the Official Conference which lasted a fortnight. This conference comprised those who held appointments in some government department or government-supported institution. Its function was to review the resolutions submitted to it and, if approval was given, send them forward to the respective governments represented for implementation. Most of the resolutions were approved and a Standing Committee was set up to give continuity to the work of the Official Conference. This committee includes representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions, India and the Colonial Office.

It is hoped that much may come of these conferences and that the governments represented will take prompt action on many of the resolutions. We all know, however, that "the mills of the gods grind slowly". We will await results with interest.

"INSIDE SPAIN TODAY"

AN ADDRESS BY

WILLSON WOODSIDE

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse.

Thursday, December 12, 1946

WILSON WOODSIDE: Mr. President and gentlemen!: I am happy to be back at the Empire Club, and happy to have another trip to Europe to report on. I must say at once, however, that I am no expert on Spain. On the first page of the note-book which I took into Spain last August I find a question, underlined, *what do Canadians want to know about Spain?* The answers I wrote underneath were: What it looks like today, and what people there are saying. That's what I am going to try to cover for you here today. For I think that a curtain of sorts has been drawn between Franco Spain and the world since the Civil War which has made it a land of mystery.

Certainly this was the feeling I had as I approached the border, along the route to Barcelona. The frontier had been sealed for months to through traffic, due to strained relations between France and Spain, so by the time our train pulled into the border station of Cèrbère there were very few left aboard. Only six or seven passengers alighted at the big station which had once been so busy; and the Cook's and American Express representatives who advanced to meet them looked very woebegone.

I have always been used to making my own arrangements, and travelling in very plain style but I admit I was glad of their help in getting through the complications of crossing a "closed" border. It was closed, that is, to the passage of Frenchmen and Spaniards; and "closed" in that the trains no longer passed through the tunnel under the mountain to the big Spanish border station perhaps a mile away . For our small party the way lay over a rough mountain road. We were piled with our baggage into an old Ford truck, and ground our way up the French side of the mountain, to stop at a customs hut near the summit of the pass. Here the formalities were fairly simple—if one remembered the border-crossing custom which has become quite mandatory all through Europe today: the passing around of a package of cigarettes. I was cautioned by the French as we pulled away, not to believe everything those so- and-sos (with a thumb-jerk towards the Spanish side) tried to tell us.

Our truck had turned around, meanwhile, and now *backed* its way the last couple of hundred yards up the mountain road to the actual border line, stopping within a couple of inches of the barrier pole. That's how things are between the Spaniards and the French these days: there was a turning space a few feet over the border but the French weren't allowed to "enter Spain" to use it.

Here, protected from the constant wind behind a huge boulder—so that I didn't notice it at first and strode past, to be sharply hailed back by an armed sentry—was the tiny shack which was now serving as border entry post on this formerly busy route of international travel. The two Spaniards inside were very gruff until all the questions had been filled out on their forms and the cigarettes passed around, but then became quite jovial, and phoned down to nearby Port Bou for a couple of taxis.

In a half-hour two ancient vehicles came wheezing up the Spanish side, with a sergeant of the Security Police in each, whereupon the men of the frontier post slung their rifles on their shoulders and conducted us over to them. One of the travellers took a tearful farewell from his French wife, still standing on her side of the border line, and we were off down the mountain. Showing our passports again to a guard at the outskirts of the town, we were driven right up onto the platform of the big, deserted station.

Here porters trying with their efficiency to make up for the tedious complications of the bureaucracy, and an even sadder-faced representative of the ubiquitous Thomas Cook, eased us through further formalities. By the time I had filled out a long triplicate form for one official, received my ration card from another, shown my money to still another, and changed some of it into pesetas at a hole-in-the-wall branch of the Bank of Spain, I had shown my passport eight times since crossing the border, I was to show it three times more before I was settled in my hotel room in Barcelona that evening.

Now came the first meal, always an important event in any new country for a European traveller these days, as an indication of how he can expect to eat while he is there. It was a fair enough sample, a poor meal at a price of $2.60, with a string of taxes making it up to $3.80. The English couple with whom I ate, resident in Barcelona (which still has a colony of several hundred British business people) and just back from their first visit home since before the Civil War, ordered real coffee by calling for *caffe, caffe!* The usual thing in Europe these days is an indescribable brew of acorns and burned wheat—you hope!—and real coffee costs up to ten times as much as such ersatz, or 30c to 40c a cup. And as for my check for $3.80, I'd have been happy to find a meal at such a bargain price in Barcelona or Madrid.

Finally the train for Barcelona was ready and I climbed into the First Class, which I had been quite rightly counselled was the "only way" to travel in Spain. But more of that later. My companions turned out to be a retired minor Spanish diplomat and a couple of army officers, a businessman and a young Jew formerly of Munich.

The talk between the diplomat, the young Jew and myself, in English, French and German, was surprisingly free, though translations in part had to be given to the others, who looked uncomfortable over this contact with someone from beyond the border. The diplomat's declaration that he would never again work in a country dominated by the military—supposedly referring to Tito's Yugoslavia—was not, however, translated to the officers. Curiously enough, the young Jew spoke the only words I heard in the entire trip favorable to the regime, adjuring me not to believe anyone who told me that the people wanted any other government, and looking around for approbation from the others. It could well have been the sort of double-talk that people living under dictatorship learn to use. But as I say, it was the only good word for the Franco Government which I heard during the fortnight's travels.

All along the way to Barcelona the number of troops which have been mobilized and concentrated in the border regions were much in evidence, loafing disconsolate in the stations or shuffling about their work in the towns. Reaching Barcelona, I thought that after all my travels I had finally lost my bags. The destitution of the crowd argued that my stuff would be worth a good sum on the black market, and morality concerning property rights has taken a terrific slump in Europe since the war. But I must say that, at the exit where I had expected the porter to take the bags I was overwhelmed with offers of help in finding them, and soon conducted to another exit on the far side of the station where my man was waiting honestly for me.

Barcelona still appears the fine city of which I had always heard. Its wide, handsome boulevards, with their florid, individual style of architecture, show no damage whatever from the Civil War. The street cars at once took my eye, because they looked like copies of the new cars here in Toronto; which recalled to my mind the fact that the Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company is in fact a Toronto firm, a subsidiary of Brazilian Traction.

At any rate, here in ruined Spain were handsome, stream-lined cars just like the ones we are proud of in Toronto, (though to be just, they are made in St. Louis). The Barcelona cars had been built in Italy, and delivered in 1943—which is a commentary on Italy's "total" production for war.

Canadian and British initiative may provide the new cars, but they are of course run by Spaniards. In fact, each car is run by *four* men: one as motorman, one to sell tickets, another to check the tickets periodically, and a fourth standing by the side door, ringing the bell for those who want to get off, and shouting at those who want to get on, to go to the front door. That's necessary because some of these cars, of the same design, have big signs directing people to get on the side doors! If I add that four different lines, all run by the same company, have different fares for the same stretch down one of the main streets, you will have a fair introduction to Spanish bureaucracy and inefficiency.

If one compared Barcelona to Milan, which seemed apt, it is in some ways a handsomer city. But as the main industrial centre of Spain it hasn't anything like the vitality of the Italian industrial capital, which I had visited only a fortnight before. And though Spain's war had been over for seven years, and Italy's only for a year and a half, there was no comparison in the range of goods to be had in the stores of the two cities. It appeared to me that the Spaniards stood a long way behind the Italians in technical ability and inventiveness.

There was an air of stagnation about Barcelona, which all too obviously could never have been built, and could not be supported, by today's business. The city's great days of expansion were in the 1920's, when the country was stable and foreign capital came in readily.

The thing which strikes one at first sight of the street crowds of Barcelona is the number of people struggling to carry on an existence in marginal occupations, such as shoe-shining, selling lottery tickets or single cigarettes, carrying sandwich boards or peddling odd articles from cafe to cafe.

You see an ancient, grinding poverty in Spain which is quite different from the new poverty to which millions of people in Central Europe have been reduced suddenly by war damage. The poor in Spain are more like the ragged, dirty poor in Dickens' novels. And they are many: sometimes I thought that one person in twenty in the cities was engaged in trying to sell tickets on the national fortnightly lottery to the other nineteen.

The Sunday morning crowd on the famous Ramblas was one of the most unsmiling I have ever seen in a

Latin country. But as in all Latin countries the children were dressed with a special effort for Sunday. And that night I found a street fair going on, over an area of perhaps 10 square blocks, with each little street decorated differently, in competition with the others, and many dancing platforms and small refreshment booths set up. The fair opened each night at midnight, and ran for a week. They told me it was a centuries-old custom.

Another feature of the Barcelona boulevards was the police. There were smart, white-coated traffic police; Guardia Civil, walking in pairs and wearing the quaint three-cornered hat; and Security Police, in half military uniform, carrying sidearms by day and stationed with rifles at night on every corner of every main street and often on the four corners of an intersection. I took these at first to be the S.S. of the Franco regime, but that is not an accurate comparison. They are not a political force like Hitler's Elite Guards. They are a Government police force, not a crack militia of the Falange Party. The Falange is a long way from having control of the government in Spain, as the Fascist Party had in Italy, and the Nazi Party in Germany. As if this were not security enough, small squads of troops also patrolled the Barcelona streets at night. Franco has not forgotten that this was one of the two main centres of resistance to him.

I met people who claimed that all this policing was necessary to combat banditry, and insisted that a great many people appreciated the complete security of the streets when going home late at night. It was claimed that an unattended woman could, if she had occasion, walk alone and unmolested through the streets of Barcelona or Madrid at two in the morning. I must say, in honesty, that the police never bothered me. I never had the feeling of being followed, and never suspected that my baggages or papers were searched in my room. But I just don't feel comfortable in a police station and instinctively hate them, whether they are supposed to be Fascist "New Order" or Communist "New Democracy."

Among the street crowds were many soldiers on leave from the frontier districts, young conscripts mostly, dejected-looking in their dirty, unpressed uniforms—and not surprising when you learned that they receive the munificent pay of half a peseta a day to "squander." Its buying power would be about 1½c. But as is the custom of such regimes, Franco looks after his army officers well.

Trying to buy my first newspaper, I had a curious experience. The first three dealers said they didn't have change for the small note, I think 5 pesetas, which I tendered. I gained the impression that, having only the Falangist paper left, they didn't want a newly-arrived foreigner to get his ideas of Spain from this. Other days, when I came earlier, they always handed me the *Vanguardia,* which I found to be surprisingly good paper. It was by no stretch oppositionist, but as "unfascist" as possible under the conditions of press control. It always sold out quickly, and I was not surprised to hear that it was considered the best paper in the country.

I mention this because just the other day I received a very intelligent letter by air mail from Barcelona, apparently uncensored, discussing excerpts from my articles in *Saturday Night* on my Spanish visit. It seems they were reprinted in *Vanguardia,* though I can only try to imagine, from the comment of this correspondent, the parts of my account which must have been omitted.

As a writer I naturally have a particular interest in seeing what people are allowed to read in totalitarian countries, and here as with the *Vanguardia,* I had a pleasant surprise. I noted in the kiosks along the streets reprints of Winston Churchill's books; Thomas Mann and Stefan Zweig, both anti-Nazi; Walter Scott, Charlotte Brontë, Joseph Conrad and G. K. Chesterton; and Sinclair Lewis, Jerome K. Jerome and P. G. Wodehouse. There was a new biography of Peron, not too prominently displayed, but also one of Alfonso XIII, the king deposed in 1931.

Looking over the movies I found that they were playing many of our best films of recent years, such as Rebecca, How Green Is My Valley, All This and Heaven Too, Suspicion, Paderewski in Moonlight Sonata, Shirley

Temple, Charlie Chaplin in The Gold Rush, and The Song of Bernadette. I was a bit surprised to find them showing, in "Lady Hamilton", the victor of Trafalgar. All were dubbed in Spanish language, and no films are played even in Madrid in the original English with printed sub-titles any more, as is common in other European capitals.

Though the famine of intellectual fare is a serious one through most of Europe today, the food problem is of course more immediate and pressing. I found the food situation bad in Spain, and was told that it had been getting slowly worse for several years through a succession of poor harvests and the country's stagnant foreign trade. The basic ration today is a half-pound of bread a day, with small quantities of other things such as sugar, potatoes, beans or meal of some kind. Everything else has to be bought on the black market, at five to fifteen times the normal price.

There had been no meat at all for five months during the winter, and during this time eggs went up to 25c apiece—and this in a country, mark you, whose war was over seven years ago. The limit seemed to have been reached when the olive oil ration was reduced, just before my arrival, to 2 ozs. per fortnight. Oil is a basic commodity in Spain, and this produced the quip, "In what way is Franco a magician?" The answer: "Because he can fry 27 million people in 2 ozs. of oil!"

Another story with an angle on the Spanish character, which I picked up in Barcelona, was about a group of British residents who went to the Civil Governor and suggested that a branch of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals should be formed in the city. The Governor was agreeable, and the discussion turned to how to finance it. "But, of course," the Governor exclaimed, "we must stage a bull fight!"

Speaking of the Civil Governor, there is a Military Governor above him, and a Lord Mayor below him. The Spaniards never miss anything when it comes to bureaucracy. Many people thought that it was a definite policy to draw as many as possible into government employ, to give them a vested interest in maintaining the regime, as they could expect to go out with its overthrow. It is mainly these people who make the "spontaneous demonstrations"—such few as there are in Spain these days.

This bureaucracy is a deadweight on the country. Wretchedly ill-paid, many of the civil servants take "squeeze" in one way or another. A typical story, of many which I heard, was of a radio store in Barcelona. It had a radio stolen, but why bother reporting it? The police would only keep it, if they recovered it. Then a second radio was stolen. This was getting serious. The store owner sought out one of the police detectives privately. The detective's price was 500 pesetas—nominally $100—to find the set. This he promptly did, and offered his "protection" to the store owner at a flat rate of 200 pesetas a month. He said he had many satisfied clients!

In the same way, you give a hotel porter 100 pesetas to split with the railway ticket official, if you want a berth. Though I must admit that there were exceptions, and once or twice tips which I proferred were refused and I was served with the greatest courtesy for nothing. I should say, too, that time and again I met with an ingenious efficiency in private Spaniards, who had apparently had to acquire it to circumvent the restrictions and delays of the bureaucracy.

The overall impression, however, was of one of the most inefficient peoples I have ever met, with an incredibly inefficient system of government. I noticed, for example, the number of unfinished projects such as highway bridges, in my travels across the country, and was told in all seriousness that each new regime in Spain feels it a matter of honor *not* to complete the projects started by the previous regime.

As another example, foreign trade is entirely in the hands of the government, permits have to be obtained for everything a firm may want to import, and take months to obtain. For the necessary lobbying with the government firms from all over Spain maintain offices or agents in Madrid. With everything so difficult to obtain, the tendency is to grab almost any kind of imported machinery you can get hold of, in the hope of swapping it for what you want.

Thus a firm near Barcelona which had been trying to get a Diesel power plant was recently alloted one of six which the government had secured from Metropolitan Vickers in Manchester. It was the wrong voltage for their system, and very expensive—over $100,000—but they took it in the hope of swapping it inside the country, as they knew it was the only one they would get. The whole country, my informant said, was run in this way. He couldn't imagine why any foreign firm would put money into Spain these days. Those that were there were taking a bad beating.

But I must say that many of these people whom I met, particularly British, liked the Spaniards personally and liked living in the country in spite of the government. For my part, I found it a real pleasure to talk with Spaniards, with their quick intelligence and their friendly attitude towards Anglo-Saxons, and was surprised constantly to find how much they understood of what was going on in the world outside. This doesn't go, of course, for the mass of the people, living in abysmal ignorance and grinding poverty, their comprehension barely extending to the frontier.

Let me detail just one of these conversations. It was with the waiters in an excellent little restaurant—I shan't even say what city it was in. I was the only customer left. The head waiter, with a fine, strong, sad face—very Spanish—opened by asking me whether there was sympathy among the English people for the government or the people of Spain? I assured him that our sympathy was with the people.

He had noticed my press card from the Paris Peace Conference when I pulled it out with my ration ticket. How was Paris? He had heard that you could eat wonderfully there. He was keenly interested in my brief comparison of conditions in France, Belgium, Germany, Austria and Italy, and relayed the main points to his two companions standing nearby.

Then we came back to Spain. The people here were not pleased, he said, with the actions of the English. They thought the English had supported the government and not the people of Spain. They had thought that when the war was over, we would force the Franco Government to go. They wanted a democratic country, where a man could speak his mind without so many police—with an eloquent glance over his shoulder (obviously, however, he trusted his three fellow-waiters).

He knew that it wouldn't be easy to set up democracy in Spain. There couldn't be immediate universal franchise, as the people just weren't educated or trained for it. I said that what we hoped for was an evolution to freer government in Spain, without a renewed civil war. No, No! he cried, no more civil war; and the others nodded vigorously. Then he said that the Spanish people did not want Communism. It was just the same as Fascism. It was Fascism of the left.

So I asked, what about a monarchy? He replied that there was not much feeling for the monarchy, outside of the traditional classes, and very little among the youth. He himself, however, thought that monarchy was the best system for Spain—if you had a good monarchy like the English or the Dutch. I went on to ask him if he really believed that the Spanish people could run a stable democracy, like the British, with their House of Commons? Ah, well, he answered, the British were unique in the world as a moderate, solid people. He was specially impressed by the fact—which he already knew—that in Britain the rich and poor received the same rations. And I may say that that single point has given Britain great prestige all through black-market-ridden Europe.

From there we got on to Spanish rations, and he gave me the exact figures for them, adding that very often these are not honored. Concluding, he said that in general little business in Spain was in very bad shape, while big business was rushing to put its money into solid things—by which he explained the many new bank and insurance buildings I had noticed going up. This is only one of many examples I encountered of extremely literate Spaniards living a shadow existence in a police state.

On the train to Madrid, I had a long talk with a chemical engineer. He said that one only vegetated in Spain: one ate, slept and worked, and that was all. He wanted to get away to America. Things had been getting steadily worse for the past three or four years. As fellow engineers, we discussed the state of Spanish technology. It was very far behind the times, he declared, and the authorities were only just beginning to urge young men to study it. Yet he did point out that the train we were on was Spanish built, the coaches made in Barcelona and the locomotives in Saragossa. We were then approaching the latter city, some hours late on a clear summer day.

This railway line is the most important in Spain, running between the country's two largest cities. Yet there was only a train three times a week. It took 16 hours to travel some 400 miles, almost always running hours behind schedule. Even the first class was crowded and dirty, the aisles packed with people sitting on their suitcases. The diner was without question the dirtiest I have ever seen. The Spanish travellers wouldn't eat in it, or pay its prices. Never before had I seen people in the first class pulling sandwiches, wine and sausage out of their bags and eating lunch—offering me some too.

At all the main stops beggars swarmed through the carriages, little ragged children looking just like the *bez przorni* or homeless waifs I had seen in Russia before the war, and mothers holding dirty, scrawny little babies. I soon had to admit that it was a hopeless task to relieve the poverty of Spain singlehanded. Looking out at the countryside you could see why Spain was poor. We passed through hundreds of miles of arid wasteland, with old, eroded hills and not a stick of timber. A couple of irrigated valleys, their green so kind to the eyes, only pointed up the contrast. Here on tiny allotments the Spaniards showed that with the magic of a little water they could work well, wasting not the space for a single plant.

Certainly, of all Spain's needs, water is the greatest. Water and good government. And they go together, because only good government can give Spain the irrigation schemes she needs so desperately. How well this is realized is shown by a long feature article which I noticed in a Madrid paper a few days later, describing how the British had made India "the best-watered country in the world." The fatalism of a people who have known so little good government in centuries is shown, however, in a story which tells of all the good things which God gave Spain. He gave her sun and wine, mountains and sea. Why, it is asked, didn't he give her good government? If he did that, all the angels would leave Heaven!

It was, I thought, most revealing that so many Spaniards of all sorts with whom I spoke—and I don't claim that I got to the peasantry or the factory workers—spoke of the government of Primo di Rivera in the '20's as "the good old days." Under his light-handed, "white" dictatorship Spain had enjoyed a time of prosperity and stability. Though it wasn't entirely appreciated at the time, these were the best days Spain had known for generations. This brings up a story of Primo which I had from a very intelligent French journalist before I left Paris. Going to Spain in 1928, he had been asked by his editor to get an interview with Primo, which he had managed. The upshot was that Primo asked the Frenchman to come to see him again, after looking over the country.

In the second conversation, the dictator asked my informant what he had thought of the condition of Spain. My friend replied with the usual comment that the fine new motor roads were very impressive and the train service far better than on his last trip—and so on. "Yes, yes," Primo said, "they always tell me that. But will you answer me this question? *How does one end a dictatorship?* I have studied history backward and forward, and can find no answer. Consider my situation: if I increase the pressure on the people, there will be an explosion; but if I relax it, the King will have to go and I don't know what will become of Spain." There, surely, was an unusual dictator, asking how one could end a dictatorship.

But we must get on to Madrid. Here I met the police control which impressed me the most sharply. I should have said before that on every train plainclothesmen go through the compartments asking to see passports and the triplicate police registration forms which each person must obtain before leaving his own town, and must turn in at once to the police in the town to which he is going. The same check is made of travellers on the highways. A Spaniard has to present a satisfactory reason for travelling, and all his movements are on the police files. Former adherents of the Republican side in the Civil War are mostly kept in their home districts by this system, though I met a few who had been permitted recently to come to Madrid to work, and also heard that quite a number who had been serving long prison sentences were being released.

The particular police control of which I was going to speak was this. On arrival in Madrid I hurried out to get a taxi. Climbing in, I gave the taximan my hotel address. The taximan stopped by a policeman guarding the station exit and repeated it to him. I hadn't been in Madrid five minutes before the police had a check on me!

Madrid is a handsome city. It is much finer than King Carol's pre-war Bucharest. But it gave me much the same feeling of a capital drawing the cream off the whole country. It has no industry, is in no way self-supporting like London or Paris. Holding mainly the government bureaus, the offices which industry and commerce must maintain there to deal with the government, and the town houses of the big landowners, it is a deadweight on the country.

The hours which the capital "works" were as incredible to me during the difficult summer of 1946 as they were to Sir Samuel Hoare when he went there in the critical summer of 1940. Then as now, General Franco, his government aides, and high society had packed off for the cooler climate of San Sebastian, with the whole diplomatic world following perforce. The lower ranks left in the ministries worked from nine until two. If you phoned a business person at eleven in the morning he would like as not suggest that you come to see him at six or six-thirty in the evening. Lunch time was two to three in the afternoon, with people lingering over the tables in the garden restaurants till after four. Afternoon tea?—well, I saw a shop advertising "5 o'clock tea at Seven"!

Throughout the afternoon there would be absolutely nobody on the main downtown streets. Of course, it was hot, but the Spaniards were making the most of the excuse. Between six-thirty and seven the streets would fill up as by magic; by eight or half-past the people would be streaming out of office and shop; and by nine-thirty or ten you could find dinner. The men were the best-dressed I had seen on the Continent this trip, and the women the most beautiful since Budapest in 1939. But all along the streets wretched people would be trying to peddle single cigarettes, or lottery tickets, and ragged boys running to hold the doors of taxicabs.

I am not much used to the "Palace" hotels of Europe, but found I had been well-advised to stay at the "Palace" in Madrid. It was excellently run, perhaps the best-run hotel I stayed in Europe last summer. It may have been for this reason that it was the favorite German headquarters during the war. Hoare tells in his book (*Ambassador on Special Mission*) how it swarmed with spies, agents and "tourists" of various kinds in those days, and how these people strutted about, talking loudly in the streets. There may still be some Germans left in Spain—there were several large business colonies there before the war—but if so they have quite gone to ground, fearing deportation. You never hear a word of German or see a German movie being shown, and most German-owned cinemas and restaurants have changed their names from Rheingold, Valkyrie and so on to the Spanish equivalent.

The leading foreign influence is now British. With great satisfaction Walter Starkie—the former director of the Abbey Theatre, Dublin, and author of travel books on Spain and Italy—tells of how people thought he was crazy when he came to open up the British Institute in the fall of 1940, just when the Battle of Britain was on. This certainly impressed the Spaniards, however. They reasoned that if the British were opening up a new cultural institute at such a time they must be confident of winning. Some Spaniards showed themselves bravely at the British Institute from the beginning, at a time when German intimidation and the disfavor of the authorities made this a dangerous thing to do. Gradually more and more came, and today the Institute has 2000 students in Madrid, and thousands more at branches in four other cities, learning English, or taking lectures in British literature, industry, government, etc. Perhaps an even greater achievement of the Institute has been in securing a place for English on the Spanish school curriculum, equal to that of French and ahead of Italian and German. It is Starkie's view that the British and the Spaniards "just naturally get along together", regardless of politics. They each have the habit of trusting a person's word. You can go to a restaurant where you are only slightly known, I was told, and if you have forgotten your money or spent more during the evening than you expected, you can not only tell the waiter that you will send the money to him next day, but probably borrow a hundred pesetas from him as well!

Except in the University quarter Madrid shows scarcely any sign of Civil War damage to its buildings. Yet every street has its walking mementos, one-legged and one-armed men, as many as I saw even in Germany and the ragged and stunted orphaned children, picking up a living Heaven knows how. All dates in conversation are referred to the Civil War: before, during, or after. Its memory is burned deep in everyone's consciousness.

There is a general horror at the thought that it should be renewed.

That is basic to the talk of how the Government can be changed, talk which goes on endlessly. As is said, I never heard a good word for Franco. He is considered a little man, cruel and unbelievably complacent, but cunning in holding a balance. He is a master of the old Spanish technique of doing as little as possible, in the confidence that others will make enough mistakes to save you. There seems no doubt but that he has been helped considerably by attacks from outside the country, particularly from the Soviets and their sympathizers in every land. Many observers insisted to me that, just when Franco was at his weakest last January, the strong attack by Bidault and the closing of the French border saved him.

As the situation appears, from my all-too-brief investigation, the Fascist Falange Party has been much weakened since the end of the Civil War. Its uniformed militia are rarely seen any more, and are detested as hoodlums even by Church leaders who favor an authoritarian regime. As to the Church, there is not much sign that it has learned a great deal—or that anyone else has, for that matter. Yet I was told that there has been some movement within the Catholic Action and among a few progressive priests to form a liberal Catholic party on the lines of the French M.R.P. No new government, it was emphasized, could hope to last without the support of the Army and at least the tolerance of the Church.

All calculations as to how the government could be changed begin with the British, not with themselves. The British, so the formula goes, must put on pressure which would induce the Army to withdraw its support from Franco, as a losing proposition. This was widely expected in Spain after V-E Day. I pointed out that the British were fairly busy at that time with urgent matters at home and abroad; yet it is clear that we did miss then our best opportunity for forcing Franco out. The Army, the argument continues, would withdraw its support from

Franco, presumably with our agreement to let go into exile in the Argentine(if Peron would care to have such a symbol of failure about). But the Army would *never* call in the government-in-exile, waiting in Paris, made up of its enemies of the Civil War. Probably the support of British or American troops would be needed to plant this regime in Madrid, and in that case, as more than one of these illogical and traditionally zenophobic people admitted to me, they would fight us!

The best that the Spanish Army could be expected to do is to take as its leader the moderately liberal and highly-respected General Aranda, call the pretender Don Juan to the throne and support a new government of conservatives, liberals and, just possibly, the Socialist leader Prieto. I met Prieto during the San Francisco Conference and had a long talk with him, so I was interested to find that, due to his reputation for honesty and the fact that he had remained out of the government-in-exile in Paris and would have nothing to do with the Communists, he was by far the most popular of the exiled politicians.

To sum up, a left-wing monarchy is the new formula being discussed in Spain. It is obviously drawn from the examples of the British, Dutch and Scandinavian monarchies working smoothly with Socialist governments. Just as obviously, this is much too sensible and moderate a solution to be carried out by this impractical, passionate, poverty-stricken people, uneducated in its broad mass, with no tradition of popular government and no successful experience in it. They aren't going to change their character and leap from the 18th century straight into the 20th at the shout of the magic word "democracia."

There is no easy solution to the Spanish problem—so persistently before the United Nations these days—and I am inclined to think that the prospects for setting up a stable and progressive democratic regime in Spain are far less favorable today than when the Republic was proclaimed in 1931.

"MUSIC AND PEACE"

AN ADDRESS BY

ETTORE MAZZOLENI, B.A., B.Mus.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, December 19, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Ladies and gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and ladies and gentlemen of our air audience. I want to say how pleased and how honoured we members of the Club feel today in having the ladies with us at our Christmas meeting. And I would like to pay a tribute to the Executive Committee of a few years ago who inaugurated this custom. I feel confident you will enjoy the excellent entertainment today and I hope you all may be with us again next year and in years to come.

And to the ladies and gentlemen listening in on the air, may I say that you, too, are most welcome and I only regret that you may not be present to enjoy this delicious Christmas luncheon with us. However, keep tuned to this station for I assure you a musical treat is in store for you.

This year the Toronto Conservatory of Music, a department of the U. of T., celebrates its Diamond Jubilee. Many of us may not realize that this is the largest school of music in the British Empire. Apart from the local students, whose numbers run into many thousands, nearly 25,000 students of music throughout the Dominion are examined each year by the Conservatory's travelling staff. We welcome today, as one of our honored guests, the Principal of this University of Music—Ettore Mazzoleni. Many of you have seen Mr. Mazzoleni conducting the symphony for he is also Associate Conductor of The Toronto Symphony Orchestra.

Mr. Mazzoleni was born in Switzerland—of Italian parents. He received the greater part of his musical education at Oxford University in England. For two years he was on the Opera Staff at the Royal College of Music and he was also collaborator with the great English composers—Vaughan Williams and Sir Adrian Voult.

Mr. Mazzoleni came to Canada in the late twenties, becoming a Member of the Faculty of Upper Canada College and for several years was associated with The Toronto Conservatory of Music, being appointed Principal last spring.

It is my pleasure to now introduce, Ettore Mazzoleni, B.A., B.Mus.

ETTORE MAZZOLENI: It is a great pleasure for me to speak to-day at the Christmas luncheon of the Empire Club. It gives me the opportunity of meeting many old friends; it gives me the opportunity of speaking to you as a serious musician at a time when music is all about us; and it gives me a very welcome opportunity of speaking to a Club that has shown a lively interest in almost every field explored by the mind and spirit of man, in politics—both domestic and international—in economics, in education, in science, and in the arts: although I am a little suspicious of the fact that you wait until your members are thoroughly disarmed by a large Christmas meal and the presence of the ladies before you introduce to them a musician!

It is now many months since the victory of the Allied forces brought to an end a long and devastating war that must hold up the development of those nations in its direct path by decades. In this ordeal of sudden shock and brutal violence the great Commonwealth of Nations whose heritage we so proudly share played a magnificent part. To-day, in the face of new responsibilities and a changing pattern of life, we must be prepared to play a part no less important than that we played during the years of war.

The building of peace will not be an easy task.

Tyranny and oppression have been overthrown, but all about us is confusion and mistrust, chaos and hatred. There was a time, in the last century, when men seemed to assume that a state of peace was the normal condition among highly civilized people. They reasoned that the new weapons which had been invented since the discovery of gunpowder were at the disposal of the civilized, and that the uncivilized could only learn to use them at the cost of ceasing to be uncivilized. The reasoning never changed. But among the changes that came over the human mind in the 1900's was the realization that war is an ever-present danger throughout the entire world. A danger to civilization itself.

The building up of peace usually means the changing of frontiers, the setting up of new governments, and new national allegiances. In theory peace is made by agreement. In practice it seems to be made by disagreement among those powers or states which have agreed to take part in making the peace. The exit-doors of the peace-conferences are too plainly marked.

But these problems are the concern of politics.

I want to ask you just now to consider another problem—not politics, but art, or culture, or enlightenment, whatever you choose to call it.

There are other values than political and economic systems that serve to build the world and to build peace. These are spiritual values. And of these none is more important than culture. If we are to have a true peace, a peace based upon that freedom which is the best of all things in the life of man, then we must support only a policy which combines both political and cultural leadership.

In his address at the opening of the Berkshire Music Centre this summer, Serge Koussevitsky, the conductor of the Boston Symphony Ochestra, spoke with deep feeling of this problem. He said, "If we conceive culture as part of the spiritual life, then their dissociation becomes a great evil and is now intolerable. Just as a body is dead without the spirit, so is a political state dead—a lifeless organism—without the progressive forces of enlightenment and culture."

The day is fast coming when artists and other men of creative thought, who are commonly supposed to be outside the sphere of practical accomplishment, will be recognized again as a very necessary force in the development of a progressive society and the making of a permanent peace that has as its security not fear but a common understanding among all men. There is one language which can speak to us all—the language of music. For that reason I suggest that we look at the present state of music in contemplation of, and preparation for these new responsibilities of a changing art in a fast changing world.

One fact about music to-day is obvious—there is a far greater quantity of music than at any other time. Its influence and its quality—and it is a commonplace that quantity does not mean quality—may be open to question. But the quantity is there, and is altogether remarkable.

Music is abroad. Music, which for so long belonged to the church and the priviledged few who had the time and money for its enjoyment, has become more and more a part of the life of the people. It is fast becoming a truly democratic art.

Mechanical inventions, such as the radio and recording, have made the literature of music readily available to everyone—to the man-in-the-street, if he ever goes home—so that it is no longer a formal occasion confined to a hall.

But mechanical inventions are not alone responsible. Almost a century ago music became increasingly popular in central Europe with the industrial changes taking place. It was wisely fostered by industrial powers, so that the old traditions of music became a habit of the people. In England a similar growth of interest in music took place during the first decades of this century. A more swift-moving growth, as you would expect, coming so many years after the other, it has continued while the movement in central Europe stagnated. In America the growth has been even more recent, but when it came it came with the swiftness and enormity that are in keeping with all the legendary tales of the Americas. The depression—psychological and economic—which hit Europe after the first Great War was too much for its aging musical traditions. The depression which hit the Americas in '29 coincided, paradoxically enough, with the greatest period of musical development.

We cannot gauge the full possibilities of radio—in fact, there was a time when the authorities had not the slightest idea where they were going or what they were trying to do. (Many have still not found out.) There was at first an excess of music both good and bad—particularly bad—because the programme-makers had to assure themselves that whatever they gave the public would be intelligible to the lowest intelligence among listeners-in, and would not offend the religions, political, or moral principles of any single member of the community—a condition that must deprive any programme of life or colour.

Now, no one can be quite sure what music is all about, so it became the very stuff of radio.

But anything that is insipid is the worst of its kind, particularly music, and when it is linked with cheap sentiment and cheap morality it can reach the lowest depths of bad taste. And in this machine-made age we have had more than our fair share of bad taste.

This, however, is only the beginning of the story.

At first it was feared that radio might empty the concert-halls, even close them. Quite the contrary. Radio brought music to countless listeners who had known nothing of it. Out of this vast audience came many asking for more. Dissatisfied with what they were getting, or made curious, they sought it in the concert-hall—and a new audience was born.

The musically-minded began by being indifferent, even scornful—Sir Thomas Beecham once asked forgiveness for the millions of fools who thought the noise they heard on the radio was music—and they continued to attend the public and private concerts they had always attended, together with the new audience. What is more, their own interests, both critical and personal, were even more stimulated by the range of experience offered by radio.

Commercialism will doubtless do as much good for music and the arts as it threatened at one time to do harm. But the means may sometimes be ludicrous.

One striking feature of the last few years has been the sponsoring of the Metropolitan Opera and the major symphony orchestras of this continent by industrial corporations. This is significant in that it suggests that big business has awakened to the fact that the public has reached the state where it can take symphonic music by itself without any sugar-coating. It may be argued that these programmes are mere window-dressing and rivalry, and that the large industrial corporations have money to spend—but now that they are spending it on music they must believe that a large part of the public wants, enjoys, and will listen to good music. The industrial corporation is fast becoming the patron of the arts.

Music, of course, belongs to two sorts of people—the makers and the listeners.

One curious thing about this spread of music has been the fact that while in most ways it was admirable for the public—although if music is to be a vital art we must be makers and not listeners only or there will soon come a time when there will be no one to listen to—the musicians themselves suffered. The greater the demand for music, the less the services of the musician were required. A few years ago the demand for players in England became so great that the pernicious substitute system came into being. Since that time radio, recording, and the movie industry have curiously affected the musician, so that either he has too much to do (in which case he cannot possibly enjoy what he is doing, and the performance suffers) or he has too little to do (in which case he cannot possibly enjoy what he is doing because he is underfed and disgruntled.)

This is an age of competence and increased skill. In music nothing is more striking than the rise in the general standard of musical technique. The very nature and demands of modern music are so remarkable as to prove this. For one good pupil fifty years ago, there must be a hundred better to-day. There can be no question, for example, of the astonishing increase in piano-technique—partly the result of the work of great teachers and pioneers in analysing technique and the methods of teaching. It would be idle to make any comment upon the improvement in orchestral playing—nothing could better illustrate this than the growth of school orchestras. In the States, which have been most progressive in this work, it would be difficult to find any High School of any pretensions that did not have its own fairly complete orchestra as well as band. The singing of good songs is no longer a specialized task for those whose former supreme achievement was the popular ballad with its one top note. This is reflected not only in the concert-hall but also in the home. Most homes have a piano—often a relic of the Victorian era when piano-playing was a young lady's drawing-room accomplishment, or an heirloom of the later era when prosperity made the piano a necessary part of the furniture. There was a time when music in the home was very nearly the curse of the age. I can remember evenings of dismal ballads and so-called sacred music when the drawing-room was filled with Lost Chords and Holy Cities, and a young lady by the name of Maud was nightly invited to come into the garden no matter what the hour or weather. It was a virtue then to be profoundly dismal.

Much of this development, of course, is the outcome of the great change in the attitude of education to music. Education has been effectively bitten by the musical bug, and there is no curing the bite. Music no longer belongs to little sister; it is no longer a grim alternative to sport; it is no longer the last resort of the dull-witted. Well-taught, music is a pleasure drawn from the pupil, not pumped into him.

Music may occasionally be taken for granted. It can never again be ignored.

I have sketched for you a little of the background against which those of us who have any part in the direction which will be followed in the art of music in the next few years must work. The future belongs to youth.

When the feudalistic and ecclesiastic systems of the Middle Ages broke down they were succeeded by a revolt, especially of youth, and out of that revolt and a sense of new-born freedom arose a golden age of art and education. To-day the aggressive nationalism that found its logical outcome in the bitterness and tragedy of two great wars is slowly being replaced with international understanding. Youth is ready to rebel again. There is a new sense of freedom, a new force in life and thought that must be wisely guided. All plans for peace that have as their goal a public common good founded upon the liberty, equality, and dignity of man acknowledge the fact that education and culture must show the way. Peace and goodwill among men will result only where there is understanding and unity. And there is no greater element of unity than music. More than any other art it has the force, the power to cross barriers and to speak a language common to all. By its very nature it can sustain those values without which the world can so swiftly decline to a state of barbarism. Political and economic reforms may achieve the peace—without the spiritual values they cannot sustain it.

"YOUR UNIVERSITY AND CANADA'S FINEST GENERATION"

An Address By

DR. SIDNEY EARLE SMITH,
K.C., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, January 16, 1947

Major Clouse: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air. We, as parents, have felt at times the tremendous responsibility of supervising the academic progress and moral training of a family of one or two or maybe three or four children. Did you ever stop to consider these responsibilities in the light of nearly forty thousand? Our guest of honor today, as president of the U. of T. carries that responsibility. And in case anyone questions my figure of 40,000—that is made up of over seventeen thousand in daily attendance at classes—over 14,000 in extension courses and another 8,000 or more at the Toronto Conservatory of Music, a faculty of the U. of T. This very diversified educational task requires an academic staff alone of nearly 1,300 professors and teachers.

And when you have retired triumphantly and rather exhausted behind the evening newspaper, having successfully accomplished those few household chores concomitant with your domesticity—take encouragement from the fact that our guest of honor today carries this responsibility in relation to not merely one but over two hundred separate buildings which involve the services of nearly 400 maintenance engineers and artisans—and he still looks exceedingly fit and can even find time to join with us at luncheon.

You will agree with me that the successful administration of such an enormous enterprise as our U. of T. demands the utmost in academic ability and in managerial sagacity and we find all the required attributes combined in our university president Dr. Smith.

Sidney Earle Smith was born in N.S., educated at Port Hood Academy, King's College, Dalhousie University and Harvard University. He served in the first great war with the 9th Can. Siege Battery and the R.F.C. He was called to the bar of N.S. in 1921—and was appointed Assistant Professor and Lecturer Dalhousie Law School 1921-1925. He then came to Toronto as Lecturer Osgoode Hall Law School 1925-1929. Returning to N.S. he was appointed Dean Dalhousie Law School 1929-1934. Dr. Smith was then called to assume the Presidency of the University of Manitoba 1934-1944. Returning to Toronto in 1944 he accepted the Principalship of University College to be followed by promotion to the Presidency of U. of T.

I will now turn over the microphone to the daddy of the largest family in the British Empire—

Dr. Sidney Smith, K.C., B.A., M.A., LL.B., LL.D., D.C.L., president of the largest university in the British Empire and a member of this club, who will address us on the subject—

"Your University and Canada's Finest Generation".

DR. SYDNEY SMITH: Mr. President, members and guests of the Empire Club of Canada:

In the first place, I thank you, Sir, for your gracious invitation to speak to the members of the Empire Club. I welcome this opportunity to tell you something of the activities and programmes of the University of Toronto. I must confess that I have, these days, a degree of allergy to speaking, particularly when I recall a definition of university presidents as "pillars of brass by day and bags of gas by night'.' For your comfort and, perhaps, for my solace, I remind ourselves that this is the luncheon period. Within the past three years, I was introduced to a luncheon audience by a chairman who, after describing certain aspects of my career, stated that he had heard a declaration, in which he concurred, that if all the after-meal speeches were laid end to end, they should be left there. Last autumn, I heard Mr. L. W. Brockington state in an address to students in the Ajax Division of the University that there are in Canada more speeches to the square meal than in any other country.

As you know, I have selected for my topic: "Your University and Canada's Finest Generation". Your university is the University of Toronto. Canada's Finest Generation is composed of the young people who defended, during the perilous days of war, all that you and I hold dear. In the University of Toronto and allied institutions, we have 9,500 members of that generation. We have often heard of the predicament when an irresistible force meets an immovable body. A colleague of mine last year suggested a solution for this problem: when an irresistible force meets an immovable body there is produced an incomprehensible result. In these challenging days, I trust that your University is not immovable, I hope that the ex-service personnel will be irresistable, and I pray that the result will be an incomprehensible benefit for this city, this province, Canada, and indeed for mankind.

It was with deliberation that I chose my topic. Your University does not belong to the staff, to the students, to the alumni or to the Board of Governors. It belongs to the people of Ontario. You are all shareholders in the University—your University. You are entitled to get reports relating to its welfare and its progress. The University cannot progress or survive in a sheer intellectual empyrean. It cannot reside and thrive on a mountain top, removed from the people on the mountain side and in the valley. To change my metaphor, it cannot be a side eddy, past which rolls the main stream of industrial, commercial and agricultural life of the province and of Canada. It must seek to widen the banks of that river, clear away the debris and blast out the boulders that impede its flow. A university cannot wholly be in the busy world nor quite beyond it.

King's College was founded in 1827, but teaching was not begun until 1843. King's College became the University of Toronto in 1850. In 1853 University College was established. In beneficial partnership with the University are Victoria College, Trinity College, St. Michael's College, Knox College, Wycliffe College, the Ontario Agricultural College, the Ontario Veterinary College, the Ontario College of Pharmacy and the Ontario College of Optomery. I have neither the desire nor the intention to give you many statistics. I would point out, however, that the largest pre-war registration for courses leading to diplomas and degrees was 8,274 in 1932-1933. In 1944-1945, the comparable figure was 7,265. During the session of 1945-1946 there were enrolled in the University 13,157 students, and at this moment we have 17,061. Of that number, 9,500 are men and women who were members of His Majesty's Forces in the war. When I inform you that there are, at present, registered in Canadian colleges and universities 36,000 veterans, you will realize that your University is carrying—and gladly carrying—twenty-five percent of the load of giving higher education to Canadian ex-service personnel.

In addition to the 17,061 students registered for diplomas and degrees, there are enrolled in the Toronto Conservatory of Music, which is now an integral part of your University, over 8,000 students, and in our Extension Division over 14,000 students are taking classes. In all, your University is serving directly during this session 40,000 individuals.

It is sometimes claimed with pride that your University is the largest institution of higher learning in the British Empire. If that be true, I take no pride in mere figures. We—you and I, as shareholders—must be on guard against the real danger of regarding mere size as a reliable index of educational endeavour. While we willingly accept the obligation of serving this large body of students—over half of whom are those who stood between us and serfdom under Hitler—we should not contemplate without dismay the development of a large institution that could be properly compared to a factory with methods—salutory in the industrial field—of rapid and mass production. There are few, if any, projects in any sphere of activity that demand so insistently standards of quality rather than quantity as do universities. When the very size of registration figures makes it necessary to deal with students as inanimate counters, we would then forfeit the classification as an institution of higher learning—a university. The University of Toronto, by virtue of its federated structure, is better equipped to serve large numbers of students than unitary universities. Through the several colleges, faculties and schools, students can be dealt with as individuals, each with his or her own distinctive personality, character and talents.

The capital employed in your University amounts now to approximately $41,000,000. Two hundred and twenty-seven buildings are in use. During this fiscal year, approximately $10,000,000 will be disbursed in current expenditures. The teaching staff of the University numbers 1,545 persons; administrative, 622; tradesmen and cleaners, 1,075. In other words there are on the payroll 3,242 persons. I would not emphasize the quantitative aspects of the University in a way that would obscure the main functions of teaching and research, but I would observe that there are few, if any, organizations in the city of Toronto that mean more financially to this community. That must be true when we think of the large numbers of students who come to this city and add greatly to its spending power.

That universities cannot live remote from real life, as I stated earlier in my address, was demonstrated during the war and is now being clearly shown. During the war nigh eleven thousand students and graduates of your University voluntarily donned the King's uniform in defence of our liberties, and hundreds of its staff enlisted for specialized services or took key positions in governmental service on in war industry. The contributions to victory of the laboratories of the University were, to say the least, significant, and in some cases outstanding.

We cannot forget that 495 paid for us the supreme sacrifice.

What of its present tasks? On V-E Day it became apparent that we would have during the session of 1945-1946 a greatly increased student body. It was readily recognized that on the Queen's Park campus we would not have sufficient physical accommodation for the smallest number that we had in mind, ten thousand students. We surveyed properties contiguous to Queen's Park and in the city, but with no success. It was then possible, with the co-operation of the Provincial and Dominion Governments, to obtain part of the property that had been used during the war at Ajax by Dominion Industries Limited as a shell filling plant. Out of 3,900 acres there were carved out for our use 446 acres and 111 buildings. A large amount of money was put into the reconverting of the war plant to educational purposes. At present we have in the Ajax Division 3,300 students enrolled for first and second years of the Engineering course. Of that number, 2,637 are veterans. 2,300 students are in residence there. If the University had not made that venture in 1945, it would not have been possible to register last session over 13,000 students and this session over 17,000 students. The accommodation at Ajax is light, airy and colourful. In many respects it is the envy of students and teachers on the Queen's Park campus. I am persuaded that distinctive educational advantages have accrued from the establishment of this division in Ontario County. The word "tradition" has been defined as "opinion, belief or custom handed down from ancestors to posterity". Notwithstanding the fact that the Ajax Division was opened one year ago, on January 14th, 1946, there is to be found therein a splendid tradition that will enhance the standard of academic endeavour of the whole university. Knowing something of higher education across Canada, I can declare with assurance that the establishing and developing within one year of a college for 3,300 students is a unique undertaking in Canada. That it has been successful is due to the unrelenting devotion and outstanding services of my colleagues!

Realizing that it would be necessary to instruct third year engineering students in special laboratories on the Queen's Park Campus, construction was begun last year of a chemical and chemical engineering building, an extention to the Physics Building, and an extension to the Mechanical Engineering building, to the end that the large influx of students from Ajax in the autumn of 1947 may be adequately instructed. Last summer, in order to accommodate veterans, the University made extensive alterations in the old McMaster Building and in University College.

The University must plan forthwith to erect a new heating plant, a new library or addition to the present library, a men's residence for University College, a building for medical research, a school for nurses, a women's Hart House, additional or new accommodation for the Faculty of Dentistry, and a new Arts Building. I would be rash indeed to state that this list is set forth in order of priority, or that it is exhaustive. The need is dictated by the fact that there was no construction during the depression and World War II, and by a certain estimate that the student population of the University after the veterans graduate will be at least 10,000.

The past two years have been strenuous for my colleagues. Teachers have had time-tables which discouraged or prevented their engaging in the other essential function of a university—research. Administrators have had daily unusual problems of providing accommodation and equipment. Last June, a head of a department before leaving my office one day stated that it was the hardest session he had ever experienced in thirty years of academic work. He knocked a few minutes later at my door in order to tell me that it was also the best academic session that he had ever experienced. Why?

Because he never had such mature, hard-working and purposeful students.

This is not the occasion to speak of the record of Canada's youth in World War II. That record warrants the designation—Canada's Finest Generation. As a veteran of World War I, I proclaim it.

Despite the fears that arose in some quarters in Canada by reason of letters received from members of the Canadian Army during its inactive days of 1940 and 1941, the returned men have manifested in high degree maturity and stability. There were those who prophesied that the veterans on their return to civilian life would be, in many cases, bitter and maladjusted—victims of neuroses engendered by participation in a mechanical war. There were others who suggested that the veterans would seek short-cuts to degrees, irrespective of the inherent requirements for sound foundations for their chosen careers. There were others who anticipated that many veterans would take advantage of the splendid educational benefits provided so wisely by the Dominion Government, and then, when they were faced with academic tasks that required deep concentration and continuous application, they would withdraw from their courses. None of the conjectures of these Jeremiahs have been fulfilled. Never did your University have such excellent material with which to work. They are serious and they are able in their endeavours to recapture the years spent in uniform. They are demonstrating a resolution to prepare themselves for service to Canada in the days of peace that will be comparable to their service in days of war. There could be no higher standard for achievement!

By way of example: in one faculty the average failure rate for the first year, over a period of seventeen years, was 25.2%. The failure rate for 1,400 veterans in that year during the session of 1945-1946 was 12.3%. Even more significant are percentages relating to honours standing, that is 75 or over. For that seventeen-year period the honours rate was 11%. Sixteen per cent of that group of veterans attained honours standing. I could give similar examples from other faculties. The number of veterans withdrawing from their courses during the session of 1945-46 was about four per cent of the total number of ex-service personnel registered. That figure is not high when compared with the withdrawal rate for students who came directly to the University from the secondary schools in the pre-war years.

The students in the University who were too young to enlist during the war have a rare opportunity to work and to play alongside these veterans. They can learn from the veterans the ideas and ideals that are the very stuff of nationhood for which the men and women of the Armed Forces were ready to give of their very lives. If your University has succeeded in serving with some adequacy the members of this generation, this also has been possible by reason of the fruitful labours of those who built so well the institution in years past. In my office I am daily reminded of the contributions to the institution's progress by my distinguished predecessors, Sir Robert Falconer and Chancellor Cody.

Since Armistice Day, 1918, the world has been given the lesson that nations can be remade with astonishing rapidity, and indeed with astonishing completeness. Hitler and Mussolini recreated, within a few years, their countries for evil purposes. From my confidence and my faith in the generation of whom I have been speaking, I can envisage them with wise leadership building in their time a greater and a finer Canada.

Herein is the task of your University. As Field Marshal, the Viscount Montgomery of Alamein stated in his Convocation Address to the University on August 31st, 1946, we must "train our youth to give their best to the country in peace, as they did in war. We must pour into those who must win the peace, the spirit that won the war".

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen: For my colleagues and for myself, I pledge to give our best for this fine generation. Nothing but the best is their due! I would remind you as shareholders in your University that payments for education are not by way of tribute to a foreign power. They are not the result of extortion or solicitation by a privileged monopoly or a vested interest; they represent the contribution of a free self-governing people to ensure the prevalence of wisdom, the appreciation of spiritual values, the sway of good will, and the equality of opportunity for all to attain satisfaction through service, or, in other words, a finer generation to succeed us and better tomorrows.

"THE BROADER ASPECTS OF SCOUTING"

An Address By

MAJOR-GENERAL D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, January 23, 1947

Major Clouse: In 1923, as a guest of this Club, the late Gen. Sir Robert Baden-Powell, in speaking from this platform, stated that the predominant idea behind his organization of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides in the year 1908 was " to provide good citizenship in the rising generation". He went on to say "the Boy Scout organizations will spread brotherhood and will perpetuate from generation to generation that great comradeship that was sealed by blood between our different British nations during the late war."

How prophetic were those words! The Scouts and Guides of 1923—true to Gen. Baden-Powell's prediction—a generation later—formed the background of our heroic fighting services on the sea, on land and in the aid in the last great war.

And today we welcome as our guest of honour the Chief Executive Commissioner for Canada of that great organization "The Boy Scouts Association".

Major General Spry was born in Winnipeg and at nine years of age joined the Wolf Cubs, later becoming a Scout—I should add—a *good* Scout. He received his early education in England and later graduated from Dalhousie University. While a university student he joined the Reserve Army—was commissioner in the R. C. R's.—and served with distinction in the late war. Promoted to the rank of Maj. Gen. at the age of 31—he was the youngest officer in the British Commonwealth to attain that rank. In 1946 he was appointed Vice-Chief of the Army, General Staff, an appointment he relinquished to become Executive Commissioner of the Scout Movement in Canada.

It is my pleasure to introduce—
MAJ. GEN. D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.
who will speak to us on
"THE BROADER ASPECTS OF SCOUTING".

MAJ.-GEN. D. C. SPRY: It is a very great privilege for me to be permitted to come here and speak to you to-day.

I am sure that there are many of you who have had much to do with Scouting and other organizations with similar aims. Therefore, I feel that I may perhaps be speaking to you about a matter upon which you are better informed than I am. I am reminded of the well-worn story of the young Negro pastor who received his first appointment to a small church in the deep South. After some thought he decided to give his first sermon on the subject of "Motherhood." After some sweat and tears of preparation he delivered his sermon. On his way out of the church he found himself walking behind two ladies, one a spinster and the other a mother of ten children. He could not help overhearing the spinster saying, "Liza, we sho' am lucky to have a fine new preacher like that, what marvellous command of de language, what wonderful diction, what magnificent delivery!" To this the mother of ten replied "Mandy, I only wish I knew as little about the subject as he does!"

So, as I say, it is probably impudent for me to speak to a group such as this about any type of community or public service.

However, with this risk in mind, I am bound to say that there is a great need for those of us in Scouting continuously to speak about this great Movement, for there is a considerable lack of knowledge of our aims and intentions.

The purpose of Scouting is to produce the kind of citizens which you and I would like to have around us. As Lord Rowallan, the Empire Chief Scout, has said, "It is not a game for little boys in short pants, it is something greater than this, it is 'a way of life'." Scouting endeavours to develop in the boys good character, not for its own sake but character with a purpose—the purpose—good citizenship. It also instils in the boys a sense of responsibility to their fellow beings and a high standard of self-reliance which should prepare them for the shocks of the times.

We feel that Scouting has a very great part to play in conjunction with the church, the home and the school, in the development of young Canadians. It is a well known fact that only about fifty percent of our population has any real religious affiliation. The results of this are well known to all of you. In many cases our homes are not contributing to the up-bringing of young lads the way they did in the past. I draw your attention to the greatly increased divorce rate and to the housing shortage, both of which have unfortunate results in the standards of family life and on the way in which our young people are being brought up. In the case of the schools, we are all willing to put our children into somebody else's hands for several hours each day and yet we accept the fact that our school teachers are amongst the most unfortunately paid group in the country. What are we doing about it? I am well aware that there are all sorts of organizations endeavouring to correct this situation—I can only draw your attention to the results attained. I feel that Scouting can help greatly in the work of the church, home and school among young lads and can assist them by strengthening their influences and filling the gaps between these institutions wherever these occur.

I said earlier that Scouting is a "way of life." Through its common Promise and Law, which require Duty to God, loyalty to their country, and helpfulness to others, its method of training, and its unity of purpose and community of interest, this Movement is able to bring together boys of all races, creeds and colours. Scouting provides that common ground upon which tolerance, fellowship and good-will can flourish. For example, even to-day through Scouting it is possible to bring Moslem and Hindu boys together in India; it is possible to bring the Arab and the Jewish boy together in the same Scout camp. This Movement has grown from a small handful of boys on Brownsea Island in 1908 to some five million members in some fifty countries of the world. If it is possible to do this under such difficult conditions, surely there must be something which Scouting can contribute to this Canada of ours.

I know that here in Toronto great efforts have been made by the various supporters of the Movement. I can only ask you to add your support in any way which may appear to you to be possible. If you are in any doubt, I suggest that you visit your nearest Scout Troop and find out for yourself something of this spirit of Scouting.

As you know better than I do, the history of Canada is one of continual struggle against geography. I feel that Scouting can overcome traditional "fences" which have been erected over the years between various regions, denominations and races. I know that this is not an impossibility. Each division in the Canadian Army in this last war was a cross-section of the Dominion. It had regiments and battalions from every part of the country. I had the good fortune to go overseas with the 1st Division and so had the opportunity of observing the other divisions as they arrived in England. The strenuous training exercises and long marches did something towards breaking down the suspicions which one group had of another, but it was not until each division had been subjected to the full test of battle that it developed a really sound divisional spirit. From this test of fire the Nova Scotia miner's son found that the lad from Quebec was just as good a fighter as he was; and that the Ontario boy fought side by side with the Prairie farmer's son; and that the boy from the foothills could fight his tank as gallantly as anyone else; and the British Columbia lad "looked over the mountains" and saw that the rest of Canada wasn't so bad after all. As some of you know, every Canadian division developed tremendous "esprit de corps." This was possible because of the knowledge and confidence and trust which each unit and each individual had in his fellows. This spirit was the subject of comment time and again by officers of other Allied formations who visited us. It has occurred to many of us who have returned from overseas, that if it was possible to bring such groups together so successfully in war, it must be possible to do so in peace. I suggest to you that Scouting, because of its common purpose and community of interest can do much for Canada by assisting in the development of this grand spirit among the youth of to-day—the men of to-morrow, so that one day Canada will attain that full greatness which she so richly deserves.

There are some million Canadian veterans who saw something of this possibility during their service. In addition, Scouting is training one hundred thousand young lads to the same outlook. Such a number in a country of our population is most certainly a great step in the right direction.

Scouting is a world brotherhood, and I believe it can assist in the development of a large group of people all over this globe who have something in common. It seems to me that if you can develop this common ground there is some hope for the world. If we do not, there does not seem to be much hope, and if there is no hope, we must consider the last six years of war entirely wasted.

It has taken some centuries of political development to reach our present stage of social organization. In the days of the old city states and down through history our social organization has evolved so that it is now possible for people to live in a community in some state of tranquility. We have now reached the stage where the will of the majority is executed by elected representatives. These representatives employ some form of force such as a policeman to enforce the will of the majority. We now accept this as a normal condition in a democracy. We have even reached a stage now where provinces do not fight one another, at least not openly. This is quite a step forward. Unfortunately, while we are able to establish and maintain the peace, order and good government within our own political boundaries, we have not carried this thought forward into the international field. We have not yet reached a stage of political development where nations can agree any too readily. Perhaps we will never reach such a stage of perfection, but I can assure you that so long as we fail to organize the peoples of this world so that the will of the majority can be implemented through its elected representatives who are capable of enforcing this will, there will continue to be a state of anarchy amongst nations. I doubt if it is possible to so organize ourselves unless there is a great mass of world citizens dedicated to the belief of such a conception. We have a long way to go, yet all of you will agree that it seems rather senseless that nations should have to bang their heads together every twenty or twenty-five years. I feel that the world-wide Scout Movement can help to bring up young people of to-day to be worthy citizens of to-morrow,—citizens, intelligent enough to appreciate democracy, and prepared to play their part in the establishment of a world free from insecurity and suspicion.

Our intellectual growth has produced for us now the atomic bomb, and we have thus outstripped our moral and spiritual development. The atomic bomb has now become a red-hot cannonball. Unfortunately, we are not quite sure what we should do with it. It will require great moral and spiritual strength for those charged with these great decisions but it will also require the peoples of the world to learn to work and live together so that there may be peace on earth and goodwill towards all men, which after all is what we all so earnestly desire. I would ask you to keep in mind that Scouting is endeavouring to guide boys—the men of to-morrow—to take their place in "one atomic world." As Lord Baden-Powell said: "We are trying to bring up our lads to live sanely in an insane world." It is a long term job and it is not an easy one. It requires the support of every right-thinking citizen and I would ask you all to give whatever support and assistance you can to this great endeavour.

The task which Scouting has before it reminds me of the situation which faced Sir Francis Drake as he turned course for Cadiz Harbour to singe the King of Spain's beard. He knew that it was going to be a tough job and that it would not be completed any too easily. He said:

> "Oh Lord God, when thou givest to Thy servants to endeavour any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory."

"SHAKESPEARE IN WAR AND PEACE"

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. DONALD WOLFIT

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, January 30, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Ladies and Gentlemen guests—members of the Empire Club of Canada and our air audience:

Emerson once remarked—"The world still wants its poet-priest, who shall not trifle with Shakespeare, the player, nor shall grope in graves with Swedenborg, the mourner,—but who shall see, speak and act with equal inspiration."

That quest is concluded. Such a one is our guest of honor today, Donald Wolfit—acclaimed the greatest Shakespearean actor of this age. He has devoted his entire life to the stage and more particlularly to the study and presentation of Shakespeare's plays— Wm. Shakespeare! the greatest of all dramatists, of whom Ben Jonson said—"He was not of an age but for all time— Sweet Swan of Avon".

Donald Wolfit was born and educated in England. He began his theatrical career at 18 years of age and was associated with Matheson Lang—Fred Terry and the most celebrated actors and playwrights of his day. He and his company have played all the famous old-world playhouses—not only Shakespeare but those selected gems of Ibsen—Shaw—Moliere and Ben Jonson. During the battle of Britain Mr. Wolfit gave more than 100 performances for the armed forces personnel at the Strand Theatre in London.

We are delighted to have with us, also, Mr. Wolfits' leading lady—Miss Rosalind Iden. You will agree with me that the eulogies of Miss Iden that have appeared so frequently in the local press have been understatements.

"Sir—you are very welcome to our house: It must appear in other ways than words—Therefore, I scant this breathing courtesy."

Ladies and Gentlemen—

Mr. Donald Wolfit—who has chosen as his subject—"Shakespeare in War and Peace."

Mr. Donald Wolfit: Mr. President, members of the Empire Club: You have paid me a very great honour in inviting me here to be your guest today, and to speak to you. The task of the after-lunch speaker is a very serious one, especially when it happens to fall on someone who spends the greater part of his life interpreting the thoughts of someone else, and I should like to warn you first and foremost that actors are notoriously bad speakers, though they have a reputation for telling very good after-dinner stories; but that comes in a different category altogether. However, I had very great pleasure in accepting the invitation of Mr. Tracey-Lloyd, which came to me through my old friend Mr. Eason Humphreys, whom I met some sixteen years ago, when I had the pleasure of playing right across Canada with "The Barrets of Wimpole Street" and other plays under the direction of Sir Barry Jackson. I have always retained the happiest memories of that tour, and when I commenced actor management in 1937, I always had at the back of my mind an intention to visit Canada as soon as it was possible, with a repertoire of Shakespeare. The intervention of six years of war delayed this intention of mine, but as soon as ocean transport became in any way practical once again, I began to make plans and contacts, though it took over six months of patient plotting, not to mention the twisting, writhing and turning round the buffers of officialdom and bureaucracy, to get here; but all that effort was worth while, if for nothing else than to be able to order two eggs and bacon every morning and to really see them on the plate, thus combining a regular diet of Bacon and Shakespeare.

From the first, I was convinced that we should find here in Canada a large audience, hungry for the works of Shakespeare, and it is a splendid thing to feel the close ties that bind Canada to the hard-pressed and somewhat tired mother country, always remembering that tired mothers have great powers of recuperation. It seems to me that for two hundred and fifty years Britain has possessed the greatest ambassador that it has ever been the good fortune of a nation to possess. An ambassador who never grows old, whom age cannot wither, nor custom stale his infinite variety. An ambassador who travels with men on long and arduous journeys as their constant companion, who sits by the fireside with them on quiet evenings, who will sit undisturbed for long periods of time on the shelves of public libraries, waiting patiently to be consulted. Bound in calf, bound in cloth, sometimes with no cover to his bones at all, but withal the greatest ambassador in the world: the works of William Shakespeare.

The English, in that remarkable span of years between 1590 and 1620, made two most vital contributions to the world. The Bible and Shakespeare. The Old Testament, with its fund of colourful stories, still remains the best reading in the world, and it is splendid to come over here and to find that the Gideon Society still keep up the tradition of leaving a Bible in every hotel bedroom in this continent. I could wish that there was a Shakespeare Society which would also see that there is a volume of Shakespeare, for then no bedroom could possibly be dull that has the two masterpieces of the English language lying side by side.

Shakespeare wrote at a time when much of the world was uncharted, and there were visions of empire growing before men's eyes; Etienne Brule discovered the site of Toronto in the same year that William Shakespeare died at New Place, Stratford-on-Avon. The world was open and man's imagination could carry him to distant lands and to wealth beyond the seas. It is this imagination which Shakespeare captured so completely. Even his last play, "The Tempest", takes places on a strange island in uncharted seas, where sprites and goblins were likely to appear at a moment's notice and where the mariners might find fresh jewels to add to the crown of England. So gloriously vague, indeed, were the maps of that period that he could even, in "The Winter's Tale", credit Bohemia with having a coast line which does not exist, and which, if any dramatist ventured to state today, would call down the wrath of every critical mind, even to the meanest undergraduate. So many of his plays took place beyond the seas. Portia lived in Belmont; we none of us know where Belmont was, but it made it seem like Calcos Strand in Shakespeare's imagination, and many Jasons came in quest of her, and the shores of the Mediterranean abound in his text. How great and how many must have been the meetings that Shakespeare had with the sailors, and merchants returned from their voyages, and how greedily he must have listened in the Mermaid Tavern and the other meeting places that abounded in the Port of London, as the ships came back laden with merchandise, to the sailors stories. And there is no doubt that when the Court was not in London the players did a great amount of touring themselves. The Admiral's men and the Lord Chamberlain's men travelled far north to Scotland and to the west, and the times of plague kept them on the move, earning their bread and butter, as the Henslowe diaries show very clearly. How great, indeed, was the inspiration which England drew from the Elizabethans, and how the great names tumble over one another: Spencer, Marlowe, John Donne, Tindale, Beaumont, Fletcher, Johnson, Richard Burbage, and, greatest of all, Shakespeare.

It was, of course, an age when writing was a new discovery, printing was in its infancy and when the English vocabulary was at its finest. I always remember Dr. G. B. Harrison discussing the drama with me one day as we sat together on the banks of the Avon at Stratford, with the white swans driving past the Memorial Theatre, and he said "You know, the Elizabethans in the theatre had a great faculty, that they were literally able to get drunk on words", and personally I think there are many forms of intoxication that are infinitely worse. But what Shakespeare, our great ambassador, means to men and women at the present time is a complete form of escape from the dreary grinding toil of everyday life. It is something which is far greater than a visit to a highly coloured technicolor film can ever give, because he drives to the imagination of the audience, and I venture to say that the greatest recreation and entertainment can only be gained when the imagination is allowed full play. As Mercutio sums up his famous speech:

"True, I talk of dreams
Which are the children of an idle brain,
Begot of nothing but vain fantasy,
Which is as thin of substance as the air,
And more inconstant than the wind, who woos
Even now the frozen bosom of the north,
And being angered puffs away from thence,
Turning his face to the dewdropping south."

That, it seems to me, is the quality that was ever present in the mind of Shakespeare, and it is something which this present day world, obsessed with material results and effects, would do well to bear in mind. It is something which the millions of men who fought through this last war have sensed in a greater or lesser degree, and I think it counts for the tremendous revival of interest in the works of the great imaginative composers, both in drama and in music, for Shakespeare's plays were written like music scores to be interpreted in the theatre.

If you will allow me, I should like very briefly to give you a summary of the work of Advance Players Association, which has presented this Company for the last ten years. In 1937, the taste for Shakespeare in the British Isles was at a very low ebb. With the exception of the regular twenty weeks season at the Memorial Theatre, Stratford-on-Avon, the Open Air Season at Regent's Park, London, and occasional productions by the Old Vic in its classic repertoire, there was no body which was attempting to keep the works of Shakespeare alive outside London and Stratford-on-Avon, and it was in the endeavour to correct this that the Association was formed. So skeptical had managers become of the value of Shakespeare at the box office, that it was with the greatest of difficulty that a ten weeks tour was booked throughout the cities of Great Britain. I think there were several causes that contributed to this lamentable state of affairs, not the least of which was perhaps the teaching of Shakespeare in the schools.

For a great many years now, the Education Authorities in Great Britain have picked each year one or two set plays to be studied for the school examinations. In the boys' schools it was for many years a choice between Julius Ceasar and The Merchant of Venice, but so rarely were they taught with any appreciation of the value of the drama that it resulted in a whole generation growing up to regard the plays of Shakespeare as a task to be studied in school and not as an entertainment. It was a frequent habit for English masters to set the writing out of lines as a punishment, and there are thousands upon thousands of men who have now reached middle age who remember grinding out fifty or one hundred lines starting with "Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears", or "The quality of mercy is not strained" until they felt that the quality of mercy was very definitely strained and that if they had any ears to lend at all they would certainly not be lent to the works of William Shakespeare hereafter. At Stratford-on-Avon, I received a letter from a schoolgirl, saying that she was studying Hamlet. This term she had only read the footnotes, but she hoped to read the play next term.

Now this is a truly remarkable state of affairs, that the greatest dramatist that the world has ever produced should have been reduced to a task for schoolboys and girls, and it is something to which, in my opinion, the Education Authorities of the future should pay some attention, and correct. What is Shakespeare taught for in the schools? If he is taught only for the sake of his English and for taking obscure sentences and parsing and analysing and twisting and turning until it seems to the schoolboy that all sense has been removed from the sentence, you have given Shakespeare a life sentence in the brain of that boy, and the English master would do well to take any extract from Hansard to parse and analyse which would still remain in the end as meaningless as most politicians' speeches are.

Now, the second point I wish to stress is that if Shakespeare is being taught for the drama, then someone qualified to teach the drama, and not just an English master, should be incorporated on to school staffs. If a child wishes, or is forced, to learn algebra, it is put in the hands of a fully qualified maths master or mistress. If a child wishes to learn music, he or she is put in the hands of a qualified musician, with degrees and diplomas, and starts off by learning Czerny's five finger exercises, and then by slow degrees, through "The Bluebells of Scotland", to Bach, and eventually up to Beethoven at the end of three or four years. But if a child says that it wishes to study the drama, more often than not it is taken by some teacher very anxious to get rid of his or her own repressions, and a copy of Macbeth is thrust into its hands, and one of the greatest tragedies in the world is mutilated and misunderstood by the end of the third lesson. I do suggest that the simplest dramas which the child can comprehend most easily should be taught first, and that the early nativity plays, miracle plays and the masques and pageants of simple exposition should be allowed to capture the child's mind first, and not the mightiest works.

It was with the knowledge that this was the state of mind of the audience in Great Britain that we started out in 1937, and over the ten years which we have functioned we have slowly gathered together again an audience which comes to the theatre to see the greatest plays in the world, and one of the most remarkable testimonies is the letters we are now receiving from men and women of twenty-five to thirty who came to see us first as school children at reduced rates in the gallery and are now coming with husband or wife to occupy seats in the stalls.

The war hit us very hard when we were starting to feel our way. The call-up took our young men who were being trained for this work, and later our young women, but we presented our first London season in the blackout of 1940, when there were only eight or ten theatres open and when you had to stumble along from bus to theatre and from theatre to bus with the aid of an electric torch, tapping your way with a stick like a blind man along the curb. But the people came to that first season at the Kingsway Theatre, and for five weeks we presented the first repertoire of Shakespeare's works which had been seen in London for a great many years. In the autumn of 1940, the bombing of southern England became so intense that the tour which had been organised had to be cancelled, as transport was in a state of chaos, and London theatres had closed completely, with the exception of non-stop variety at the Windmill Theatre.

It was in September, 1940, that I approached the management of the Strand Theatre, who had removed themselves to the safety of North Devon, to let me have the use of their theatre for a token rent of fifty dollars a week, to play one hour of Shakespeare at lunchtime for one shilling per head. Having gathered together some twelve or fifteen members of the Company, we commenced to play an hour's programme consisting of scenes from the plays, songs and sonnets, changing the programme every week. London's only other entertainments consisted of an hour's music at the National Gallery under the direction of Dame Myra Hess, and an hour of ballet at the Arts Theatre. On the third performance, I arrived at the theatre after a night of Home Guard duties in Surrey, where we sat on the Surrey heights with three old rifles and five rounds of ammunition, waiting for the Germans to land in their tens of thousands, whilst half a dozen tanks were rushed to the coastal areas in order to give the inhabitants confidence, to find that a bomb had landed close by the stage door, and rendered all the dressing rooms unusable, interrupted the water supply and removed the big scenic door halfway down the street. However, we covered that hole with a piece of canvas, swept the six inches of dust from the stage, and as the auditorium was untouched, we rang up at one o'clock to the accompaniment of a warning siren, and the audience were unaware of the conditions backstage. We had some other close misses, but no other serious interruptions during the season, which continued until the following March, in which we had presented some thirty different programmes, a full length version of Hamlet, and the Merry Wives of Windsor. By this time the Battle of Britain was ended, and we left for a tour of the provinces in the hope of getting a little regular sleep.

I would like to tell you a story which typifies London's indomitable courage in the face of the Blitz. We had just concluded one of our lunchtime programmes at the Strand Theatre and a rehearsal for the following day's programme, and at halfpast three I was standing with Miss Iden and the secretary of the theatre on the curb outside the theatre, when the warning siren sounded, and almost immediately afterwards in a gap between the clouds in the fading afternoon light, we saw the German bombers heading for North London. It was a sudden and unexpected sight so soon after the warning, and it seemed as if a silence had fallen on the whole of London, and nothing was audible but the droning of the heavy bombers overhead. As we three stood there looking up, we became conscious of a fourth figure who had joined us on the corner. It was a little newspaper seller, with a few copies of the last edition tucked under his arm. There was a moment's pause as we continued to look up, and then suddenly, in a perfect cockney accent, the paper boy said: "Coo, lummy, the impertinent bastards." That phrase, with its Shakespearean flavour, will always remain in my mind as the Cockney's comment on the bombing of London.

Now, our audiences for this season were drawn from a remarkable cross-section of London and Dominion servicemen, including a very large number of R.A.F. officers who came from Kingsway every day, had their coffee and sausage rolls and sandwiches in the stalls bar, and sat for an hour listening to the words of Shakespeare.

It may have been that we had better coffee and sandwiches in our bar than other eating places, but I think it was the fact that for one hour a day and for one shilling per head, men and women could escape into the world of poetry and imagination from the destruction that was going on, or being prepared, that was the reason for us drawing four hundred people a performance. None the less, it was two years before I was able to persuade the authorities of Ensa that Shakespeare was not anathema to the armed forces, and that he still remained the greatest and most entertaining playwright in the world, and in 1942 we did our first national service tour through the R.A.F. stations and garrison theatres in Great Britain with "Twelfth Night" and discovered once again a remarkable audience growing up which wanted to see Shakespeare's plays and having experienced them in the confines of their garrison theatre discovered that to be able to go to a live entertainment and use one's imagination was a very great and important thing when the world seemed to be collapsing about one's ears. And so we continued to divide our time during the war between seasons in London, tours of Great Britain and national service in the camps and garrison theatres. There is one story I shall always treasure in the playing at these garrison theatres. Thinking that the Americans as a nation liked the plays of Shakespeare, the authorities booked us for a week at an American camp, which was at the time entirely occupied by men from the Middle West, who knew nothing of the living theatre or the art of the drama, and who had never seen Shakespeare heard of Shakespeare or wanted to hear of Shakespeare. On our arrival on the Monday, the resident garrison theatre manager said "We-'ve got a tough bunch of men here, I don't know how they're going to react to Shakespeare's Twelfth Night", and indeed he was right, for their reaction, to say the least of it, was flabbergasting. Miss Rosalind Iden, my leading lady, on her first appearance as Viola was greeted with shouts of "Hullo Blondie", which I think you will agree is hardly conducive to the interpretation of a masterpiece, and we had similar and less pleasant running commentaries through the play. We went to the theatre on the second evening in fear and trembling, wondering what would happen, when to our amazement the performance went through in perfect silence, not even applause, not a hand; the men just trooped out in silence. When the manager came round at the end of the performance and I remarked on the extraordinary silence, he said "Oh well, we fixed them all right tonight. We had the military police walking up and down the aisles with tommy guns", and this procedure was continued throughout the whole of that dreadful and exhausting week. I must say that it was a drastic method, and I have often wondered what those gentlemen from the Middle West must have thought of a British company playing Shakespeare. In December, 1944, Paris had been liberated and the Germans were being slowly but surely pushed back, and we were the first British Company to go overseas with Shakespeare, when we played a month's season in Paris, Brussels and Versailles. Here again, we found the same avidity on the part of Canadians, Americans, French and British to hear the three plays we presented, and the large number of French civilians who begged to be allowed to attend was remarkable. I have in London a six page letter from a young Frenchman giving his impressions of the performances, and ending the letter by saying: "It will be many years before France forgets the scars left on her land by the bombing of the R.A.F., and it is interpretations of Shakespeare such as yours which will help us to forget and to love Britain again." That from a young Frenchman whose home was in Rouen is perhaps the most remarkable letter I have ever received.

Our last war service was a voyage to Cairo to play a season of five plays at the Royal Opera House. Our ship was crowded with 2,300 men on their way to India—men who knew that the European war was nearly over and who were thoroughly browned off at the thought of being drafted to India. After three days, the O.C. Troops, having discovered that there were some strange cattle called actors on board asked me if we would give an entertainment. I replied that we would give a play by Shakespeare called "Much Ado About Nothing". His face was a study, but I tried to reassure him that it was a good play by a well-known author and that we could easily play it in the officers' saloon in our uniforms. Somewhat doubtfully he invited officers to attend. There was great enthusiasm though I shall never forget catching the impact of an Atlantic roller and embracing Beatrice in the middle of the church scene to steady myself and her before we could continue the scene. This play we repeated two nights later, followed by two performances of "The Merchant of Venice". By this time, the O.C. Troops had allowed all ranks to attend the performances, and OCTU, sergeants and other ranks filled the saloon to overflowing. One performance of Hamlet fell on a night when OCTU and sergeants were scheduled, and I heard some spirited bidding of a pound and thirty shillings for a seat for a free performance going on in the officers' lounge. By this time, the officers on board were telling us that they were likely to face open mutiny on the lower decks unless we could somehow give one performance for the men, who apparently had heard that Shakespeare was being played on board and wanted to see a play. So, nothing daunted, I went to the O.C. Troops, and by this time we had become very good friends, and asked him, if, as by now we were in the Mediterranean, whether we could give a performance on the after troop deck of "The Merchant of Venice". This performance took place two days later to over 1,200 men, so that by the time we reached Port Said every man on that boat had seen at least one play by William Shakespeare. The remarkable thing about this undertaking was that the officers said that we had more than half done their job for them; that they had been disturbed by the general attitude of the men's minds, the feeling of dissatisfaction at leaving for long-term service in India, but that we had started a tremendous wave of discussion. Men who had never seen a play in their lives were discussing the merits and de-merits of the theatre as against the cinema; men who had seen a music-hall but never a play were interested by comparing the two, and that the officers were finding that discussion groups, reading groups, brains trusts and quizzes were being organized all over the ship as a result of performances. It seemed we had done a job of considerable importance among that group of men; for if you can occupy a man's mind when he is on active service with something far beyond his routine duties, you have more than half won any battle. At the Royal Opera House, Cairo, where we played thirty-four performances, we found that same avid desire and the house was sold out for every performance, and we returned to England with V. E. day over and continued our London season.

I hope you will forgive this long and somewhat detailed summary of our work during the war, but it has, I think, given a practical proof of the thesis which I outlined at the beginning of my talk, which I hope has not been too dull and matter of fact for you, but as a Commonwealth of Nations, a mighty phrase, which perhaps transcends the word empire, we have in Shakespeare the greatest ambassador which any nation has been fortunate enough to possess. The living performance of his plays still contains enough to fire the enthusiasm and capture the imagination of any man or woman in the Commonwealth.

One hears stories of the men of ancient Greece walking in bands over the hills to hear and see the playing of the great Greek tragedies in times when the plays of Sophocles, Euripides and Aeschylus were not published and could be experienced only in performance. Today in the British Commonwealth it is still possible for men and women to gather together in a living theatre to hear the plays of their master dramatist, William Shakespeare, and when they return to their homes they have the added advantage of being able to take down that old and possibly tattered volume and to fill their minds once again with the glory of his words and to read such everlasting thoughts as are contained in Prospero's speech:—

be cheerful, sir,
Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.

"THE INCEPTION AND PRODUCTION OF DETOUR"

AN ADDRESS BY

LIEUTENANT J. E. R. WOOD, M.C.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, February 6th, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: We welcome to Toronto and to the Empire Club of Canada, Mr. J. E. R. Wood, M.C., Consulting Mining Engineer now resident in Vancouver, where he also spends some time at his farm at Cloverdale.

Mr. Wood, although born in Fernie, B.C., attended Upper Canada College. Proceeded, after Senior Matriculation, to R.M.C. '25-'27 (where he was an outstanding member of the football team) and graduated from the University of Toronto in Mining Engineering in 1930, practising his profession until his enlistment in 1940. Mr. Wood proceeded overseas in 1941 and was captured at Dieppe August 1942. After his escape from one Prisoner-of-War Camp, he was again captured and incarcerated in Oflag IVC (Colditz Castle) known to the Germans as an Escape Proof Camp.

Among his prisoner companions was Lieut. Col. C. C. I. Merritt, V.C. and also as our guest today at this table is Mr. W. L. B. O'Hara—late of the Royal Tank Corps, captured at Dunkirk and also a fellow prisoner of our speaker.

Mr. Wood, I understand, feels an undying debt of gratitude to the Canadian Red Cross for the food boxes generously donated to the Red Cross the total proceeds sent to Germany for our prisoners of war and he has of a book he has published "DETOUR", which graphically relates some of the experiences of his comrades.

Mr. Wood, I know, feels at home in Toronto, being a nephew of Mr. Frank P. Wood and the late Mr. E. R. Wood and I will now call on him to address us on the subject "THE INCEPTION AND PRODUCTION OF 'DETOUR'—THE STORY OF OFLAG IVC".

Lieut J. E. R. Wood: It was with considerable humiliation that I accepted your invitation to speak to you about the Inception and Production of "Detour", the Story of Oflag IVC.

The man who should be telling you this story is the late Lieutenant W. A. Miller, Royal Canadian Engineers, of Edmonton. It was Bill's original idea to collect a book of incidents that go to make up "Detour".

Without any doubt, this officer was the Canadian 'Escape King'. First of all, he stepped off the train on our way into Germany—that was in August, 1942. He was on our tunnel scheme when sixty-five of us got out of Oflag 7B in Bavaria in June, 1943. Shortly after that, along with Major Gordon Rolfe, D.S.O., and a Royal Tank Corps Lieutenant, he got out of the castle we were all concentrated in upon our recapture. He almost reached the Swiss frontier. His last escape was a magnificent solo effort out of Oflag IVC in February, 1944. Unfortunately, he did not come back from this last attempt.

We were 'bagged' in the Dieppe Raid August 19, 1942. For a few moments we will digress to answer some of the questions that Canadians invariably ask us. "Was the raid a success?" "Was it worth while?" "Should Canadians have been used?"

The answer to all three is an emphatic "Yes"!

To get the picture one must review the Allied position up to the summer of 1942. Britain, and that meant all of us, lost nearly everything she had at Dunkirk. From then until the end of 1941 her tactic was defence against invasion, to manufacture equipment, and to train armed personnel. Do not forget she had to simultaneously carry on the fight in North Africa.

Then came the Commando raids that electrified the world, to be followed by those daylight fighter sweeps of the R.A.F.

By the spring of '42 Commando 'Battle Drill' was part and parcel of the whole army, a passable force had been trained in combined operations, the whole emphasis was on Attack! Attack! Attack!

An attack large enough to test their equipment and methods had to be laid on, bigger than anything before. Dieppe was it!

The broad idea of the plan was for infantry supported by tanks to seize Dieppe and establish a defensive perimeter outside the town. Five engineer parties would then blow the harbor and other installations. Simultaneously two flanking beaches would be attacked by one-battalion parties. After the demolition the whole force would withdraw through Dieppe and evacuate.

The landing was to be preceded by heavy aerial bombardment supplemented by the fire power of several destroyers.

It looked like a nice pleasant outing!

On the Eastern front, at this time, our friends the Russians were being pushed back at an alarming rate. They had not yet made their stand at Stalingrad. Undoubtedly, Marshal Stalin was putting pressure on Mr. Churchill to *do* something. Dieppe could be a gesture.

Now why the Canadians? We had sat in England for over two years clamoring for something to do. Although only a few old sweats among us had ever heard a shot fired in anger, we spent most of our spare time thumping our chests and telling the English how good we were. At the time we thought we were the "Dagger pointed at the heart of Berlin", that one of our senior officers said we were! From my low-level point of view, it was certainly high time the Canadians had the pleasant English country air blown off themselves, and a chance to see how we could get along against the German professionals on the other side of the Channel.

How did we get along?

We got the hiding of our lives . . . that's what! Without mincing matters, it was a shocking defeat on the ground. The Germans showed us up to be the amateurs we were. Aside from Col. Merritt's South Saskatchewans on the right beach, where they established a bridgehead and withdrew when they were good and ready; to my knowledge only elements of one platoon of one company of one battalion got anywhere near their objective. The rest of us were pinned on the beach and along the sea-wall. The Royals of Toronto didn't have a chance, being landed on the left beach late as they were in daylight instead of in the dark.

The Infantry failed to secure the Front of Dieppe. The Engineers were unable to blow the road blocks. The tanks could not get off the esplanade to shoot up the town.

But those Canadian Private Soldiers, who never did know when to quit, stayed there and took as heavy a concentration of fire as anybody was ever asked to take for over seven hours, and thus added another inspiring page to our Nation's hsitory.

Why didn't we do better?

Here are some of the subsidiary reasons—

(a) No. 3 Commando on the left had the bad luck to barge into a coastal convoy. That gave the alarm and also delayed the Royals.

(b) The heavy aerial bombardment we expected was called off for political reasons. The R.A.F. could only machine-gun and cannon-fire the Front.

(c) The Navy landed our first wave about ten minutes late. This deprived our Infantry of that necessary tank-fire support. Those ten minutes let the Germans stick up their heads and get busy.

(d) On top of all this, there was no Supreme Commander. Each Service Chief ran his own show, co-ordinating as well as possible.

Some say there was a leak in Security. I understand Post-War Intelligence does not support this.

Many of we junior officers feel we should have pulled more chestnuts out of the fire. We didn't! Most people blame it on one or all the above reasons. Perhaps the real reason was inexperience. To my knowledge, only two Canadian officers had heard a shot in anger before, both in the last War.

All of us who were taken prisoner were sure we could do better the next time.

I think the real reason goes back to our pre-war indifference to National Defence matters. Our tax-payer was very stingy. Those of us who should have, did not join our Reserve Army. In the service, I was favourably impressed with the new permanent force officers I met. The trouble was there just weren't enough of them to go around. It is disturbing to see the indifference that is already prevalent, and the desire to cut National Defence to the bone again. It is to be hoped we tax-payers will differentiate between duplication on the one hand and inadequate appropriations for efficient services on the other.

What was the gain?

Everybody learned a packet. Succeeding combined operations had both a Supreme Commander and an overwhelming aerial preparation, no matter the political consequences. The Canadians smartened up and sent a division out to Sicily to learn to fight by fighting under British Command. Later many of the British units were under Canadian Command. That's the way it should be . . . all of us playing on the same ball team, with interchangeable players.

For that matter, on D-Day the 3rd Division casualties were only a fraction of ours.

But there were immediate tangibles.

The Germans had always insisted that a sizeable force could not get through the sea defences, or if it did they couldn't land. Well, the Navy swept us through the mine fields and landed us on the beach, tanks and all. This was the first time tanks had been used in a combined operation with an opposed landing.

In the air, the R.A.F. and R.C.A.F. showed who was boss. At no time, to my knowledge, were we on the beach machine-gunned by air.

The Germans were so badly shaken that they intensified their Atlantic Wall preparations. They did not know where or when we would hit next. Undoubtedly, our operation immobilized tens of thousands of troops and equipment, thereby lessening a little bit the pressure on the Russians.

But now back to the end of the battle. To our surprise we were not kicked around. We were disarmed. Officers and men were separated. The officers carried wounded. The men marched off. It is only fair to state the admirable and impartial way the Germans snapped into tending our wounded. The severe cases got first treatment, irrespective of their uniform.

That evening the wounded entrained for Rouen. Two days later we met up with the other boys at a transit camp in Normandy. A few days later we entrained for Germany. The men went to the main British P.O.W. camp at Lamsdorf, the officers to what was to be the Junior British Officers' Camp at Oflag VIIB in Bavaria, about 60 KM. from Munich. It was a Pre-War barracks.

Things were not too bad except the food. It was dreadful and very scarce.

About a week or so later the British boys blew in. They were the most generous and good-natured lot I have ever seen. Their morale was terrific. Most of them were 'bagged" two years earlier at Dunkirk. There were also the Australians and New Zealanders from Greece and Crete. We all rapidly revised our preconceived notions of "The English". Those fellows fed us, clothed us, gave us razors, books and, in fact, everything they had.

They had the Germans taped—what you could get away with and what you could not. They had everything organized—Theatres, Sports, Cooking, Study Groups. Officers turned themselves into B.A's., Chartered Accountants, Engineers, Lawyers, Linguists, Agricultural Students, etc.

We learned what it was to be 'British'. It meant Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canadians, and all the rest of us. We found that we all have an indefinable something that gives us a common ground, and broadly speaking, a common point of view. Perhaps it is the British sense of fair play, honesty and freedom! It becomes obvious directly you find yourself locked up with other nationalities.

We learned about the Geneva Convention and Red Cross parcels. Ridiculous as it sounds, none of us had ever read the Geneva Convention, and few, if any, of us knew the score on parcels.

The boys quickly smartened us up by giving us some. Those parcels were a Godsend! Without them a lot of us would have bit the dust. Those who didn't would have been very skinny, indeed. Even with Red Cross food, my weight skidded from 190 to 175. That was a good thing! I could see the shape of my hips again! Toward the end of the war, when we had only half a parcel per week, I went down to 150. That was too much of a good thing!! The sad part of it all is that my waist line has vanished once again!!

The Red Cross aimed at getting one parcel to each P.O.W. each week. All the parcels went to a Central International Red Cross Pool at Geneva. They were then dispatched to German distribution centres. One might get a British, Canadian, American or New Zealand parcel. It made for variety.

You can imagine the kick we Canadians got when the English boys told us our parcels were the best and when we saw Eatonia butter and other Canadian tinned foods.

In addition, the Red Cross aimed at 50 cigarettes per man per week. This was augmented by private parcels from home. In the case of the Canadians, we had thousands. Very handy they were, too, for trading with the German guards for food and other things we needed.

Uniforms, greatcoats, boots, blankets, etc. came to us through Red Cross channels as did Y.M.C.A. sports equipment, and plenty of it!

The Canadian Legion War Services must not be forgotten for their grand educational courses and books. Nor will we ever forget the Canadian Prisoners-of-War Relatives Association, sparked by Mrs. Asselin, M.B.E., of Montreal, who built up a coast-to-coast organization to look after our interests.

We ex-Prisoners of War will never forget the debt of gratitude we owe these societies for keeping us in one piece—mentally as well as physically.

The spring of '43, forty odd Americans came in via North Africa. They also had been on the short end of a boxing lesson.

It is now time to discuss what is ever present in a P.O.W's. mind—'Escaping'. Functioning under the Senior British Officer was the 'Escape Committee" who govern and control all such matters. The uninitiated invariably think that an escape is a solo job. That is not so. Even though a man may go out alone, you may depend upon it that there are hundreds, in some cases thousands, of man hours of help behind him—maps, compasses, clothes, food and so on.

Should anybody have an idea how to get out, their plan would be submitted to this Escape Committee. If it did not conflict with someone else's prior claim, and did not endanger the lives of others in the camp, the plan would be approved. Then the whole resources of the Escape Organization would be thrown in behind the venture.

Prior to IVC the boys had dug tunnels, cut their way through wire, marched phoney parties through the gate, jumped off trains, and so on. The effort involved for the number got out was considered too much. The Committee decided to bunch their hits by concentrating all energies on one tunnel, with the hope of getting a large number out. They did.

Several Canadians were supposed to be included in the tunnel crew. We were chained up at the time so that could not be. Then two places were allotted to Canadians. Col. Merritt, V.C. and Col. Bob Labatt, D.S.O. of Hamilton were to go. Col. Labatt's shoulders proved too wide for one particularly narrow place. I was nominated to take his place.

I'll never forget the night he called me outside to see if I wanted the spot. After putting me in the picture he said: "Were I commanding this operation, and there was a possibility of a man prejudicing the chances of those behind him by getting stuck, I would not hesitate to order him to drop out. Therefore, I'm out. You're in, if you want it."

It was the biggest thing I've ever seen a man do. Only an ex-P.O.W. can understand what it meant, particularly as this looked like a good chance to get out.

Well, all sixty-five of us got out and all were rounded up. The Germans turned out sixty thousand troops and home guards between our area and the Swiss Frontier. They seemed to be at every bridge, road intersection and woodland trail.

Coincidentally, the Americans entrained for their special camp in Poland the night we took ourselves off. Four of them jumped off the train. At the end of the journey their disconsolate conducting officer phoned up the Kommandanture reporting he'd lost four Americans. The fellow at the other end of the phone is reported to have replied in colloquial German: "Why should you worry? We lost sixty-five British last night!"

Our operation shook the Germans so badly that we were all concentrated in an old castle where we served our normal fourteen days arrest for an attempted escape. We were then shipped off to Oflag IVC in Saxony near Leipzig, the so-called International 'Bad Boys' Camp. It was their idea of Alcatraz for escape officers. There were more guards than prisoners, four daily roll calls instead of the usual two, and so on. Representatives of nearly all the United Nations were there except the Chinese and the Russians. We were greeted by three Canadians. Two were R.A.F. types, Flight Lieut. Wilson Donaldson of Lethbridge and F/O Keith Milne of Fort Qu'appelle, Sask. The other was 'Scarlet O'Hara', that red-nosed character sitting down at the end of this table, who grew up in Montreal and found himself in the Royal Tank Corps. During the German Blitz in France he found himself in a Mk. 1 Matilda Tank. It weighed 8 tons, powered with a Ford V8 engine. Flat out it went five miles an hour. On the retreat back from the Dyle? Scarlet insists he had a great race with an old Belgian woman in carpet slippers. She was pushing a cart full of pots and pans and so on. When she got going good Scarlet says she passed him, and when he got going good he passed her. She won!

Shortly after our arrival at Oflag IVC the International Y.M.C.A. sent each of us Canadians a grand diary with a large maple leaf on the front. It had nice white pages to write on and buff colored ones for sketching.

The late Lt. Bill Miller, Royal Canadian Engineers, of Edmonton, who you will recall I described as the Canadian 'Escape King', hit upon the idea of having the boys write short, punchy incidents of their military and prison career. I asked Bill if he minded if I did the same. He said: "By all means go ahead. The more the merrier!" That was the start of 'Detour".

A brilliant young English artist, a Mortar Officer by trade, by the name of Lt. John Watton, did the seventy odd pastel portraits and cartoons in the book. The Red Cross sent him the drawing materials. Incidentally, his mother was a Miss Fessenden of Toronto. He was very proud of his Canadian mother.

By the end of the war we had quite a collection of incidents covering battle, prison and escape. A Dutchman in the R.A.F. said: "Why not publish it for the benefit of the Red Cross?" The boys unanimously thought that was a swell idea.

The Americans liberated us on April 15, 1945. Four-days later we flew to England.

Being a Canadian I contacted our Canadian Red Cross through Lord Bennett, who was Chairman of the London Committee. He sent me to Col. R. W. Frost, the Overseas Commissioner. The Colonel thought the idea a good one and passed me to the Hon. Vincent Massey and to Canadian Military Headquarters. All threw in their weight, including the British Ministry of Information. The Right Hon. Sir Stafford Cripps guided us through a maze of detail.

The British and Australian Red Cross Societies agreed to join the Canadians in financing the production of

100,000 copies. V. J. Day came so we reduced it to 50,000. Ultimate paper restrictions reduced us to 16,000 copies.

These negotiations took two months. We fiddled away two more trying to get paper. It was now September. Then a Toronto Engineer, Colonel Mickey MacDonald, dropped into the little hole-in-the-wall in Cancross House that I called my office, and suggested I go over to Army Headquarters in Holland. He was sure the 'boys' could do something. They did.

Lt. Col. John Craig, M.B.E., also of Toronto, lined up the deal. The type for the script would be set up in the 1 Cdn. Mobile Printing Section, R.C.A.S.C. at Army H.Q. Then the British boys would take over. A German firm in Hamburg would print the 32 plates in four colors and the monocolor ones; the boys at Field Marshal Montgomery's H.Q., British Army of the Rhine would do the binding, while Canadian Movement Control would get it back to England.

Those English boys were simply terrific. "Of course, old boy, we'll do the job for you". Then a few minutes later: "Just what do you want us to do for you, old boy?" That is co-operation at its best. Answer: "Yes!" And then find a way to do it.

We found out later that Major Budd, M.B.E., and Capt. Ken Tollitt had been with Montgomery since before Alemein. They had followed him literally from Alemein to the Baltic.

It was now November. I returned to England. The publisher had quit because he could not control the production in Germany. Then just to cheer matters up we found that the wangle we were going to get our paper on went sour.

However, we finally got off the mark in Hamburg in January, 1946. Within four months we had the production job complete. The printing was finished in May. The type was set up by the Canadians in Holland. The Hamburg Germans did the printing; the Rhine Army boys the binding; while the R.C.A.F. flew the completed job back to England in the spare space in the 'mail can'! The paper came from England, the photo plates from Antwerp, gold for the lettering from The Northern Miner here in Toronto. A young English parachutist 'Saboteur' and ex-P.O.W., Capt. Peter Baker, M.C., acted as publisher with his Falcon Press. He was silly enough to be captured behind the lines skulking around in civilian clothes.

I made six trips to the Continent, most of them by air, and clocked up 10,000 miles in a jeep rattling about Northern Europe, co-ordinating all this nonsense. We called it the "Pony Express".

3,000 copies went to Australia, 3,500 to Canada, and the rest to Britain.

The Macmillan Publishing Company are kindly distributing "Detour" here in Canada.

The Rhine Army boys bound some deluxe copies in Morocco leather; one in blue for the King, the rest were in brown for Mr. Churchill, Mr. Atlee, the Dominion Prime Ministers and High Commissioners, Field Marshal the Lord Chetwood, who healded the Red Cross, Field Marshal Alexander, Field Marshal Montgomery, and General Crerar.

The press and radio have been simply magnificent, not only here, but in England and Australia. In England they did very well by us, indeed, while in Canada they did not spare the horses at all.

In closing may I thank you all and the people of Canada for your generous support of the Red Cross. The P.O.W. side was only one of many Red Cross Departments, but their parcels made possible by your contributions kept us in one piece. From the bottom of our hearts we say "Thank you!"

"CANADA'S COAL PROBLEM"

An Address By

RIGHT HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE
P. C. (Can.) B. Sc.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, February 13, 1947

Major Clouse: Until such time as atomic energy may be further developed on a utilitarian basis—and we are told by scientists that this may be many years away —this world will still be wrestling with the problem of coal. This problem has reached a very acute stage in many parts of the world in recent months. One of the tremendous issues that the Council of the United Nations has been obliged to face in their program for the rehabilitation of occupied Europe has been the inadequate production of coal from the rich fields of the Ruhr—for coal means the recommencing of industries as well as the comfort and health of the populace—and the sooner the millions of people of Europe may go back to industrial employment the sooner they will be self-supporting and only at that point will those teeming millions become less restless—and, in turn, less vulnerable to those doctrines that feed upon cold, hungry, workless, dis-spirited humanity.

Within the last few days we have read of the tragic situation that has developed in Britain, in spite of the government's claim that coal production has increased this year. Hundreds of British plants closed at a time when British industry—probably more than at any time in history—requires power to produce exportable goods to build up the home Exchequer.

Our guest of honour today is an outstanding authority on many subjects—one of them is Canada's coal. Mr. Howe was Professor of Civil Engineering at Dalhousie University for five years. On entering the Cabinet in 1935 he took over the Department of Railways and Canals—reorganized as the Ministry of Transport. He established the Trans-Canada Airlines and improved the National Broadcasting System. At the outbreak of the late war Mr. Howe was placed in charge of all war purchases and contracts, a tremendous responsibility ultimately involving billions of dollars. Only once has Mr. Howe been torpedoed and that was *not* in a political sense. On a mission to England in 1940 as a member of the British Supply Council for North America the enemy, pursuing their tactics of endeavouring to obliterate the great men of the Allied Councils, sank the ship carrying Mr. Howe and fortunately for him and for us all his greatest loss was one of dignity and his personal belongings and his greatest discomfort that of spending many hours in an open boat.

Gentlemen—I will now turn the microphone over to the Rt. Hon. Clarence Decatur Howe, P.C., (Can.) B.Sc., Minister of Reconstruction and Supply in the Federal Government, who has selected the subject—

"CANADA'S COAL PROBLEM"

RIGHT HONOURABLE C. D. HOWE: In casting about for a subject that may interest the membership of the Empire Club, I have chosen from among the many rather prosaic responsibilities of the Department of Reconstruction and Supply that of "Canada's Coal Problem". Although coal has been replaced by electricity for many industrial uses, and by oil for many heating purposes, it is still a major source of industrial energy, as well as a major source of domestic heating, to an extent that any serious shortage of supply must result in curtailment of industrial production, consequential unemployment, and suffering in Canadian homes.

Because coal is essential for industrial production and for domestic heating, it was the first basic material to be placed under control after the outbreak of war. From 1939 to the end of 1946, when coal was decontrolled, Canada's coal supply has been my responsibility. I have had many anxious hours on that account. Coal control has moved from crisis to crisis, but somehow or other has succeeded in providing the coal sufficient to maintain full industrial production and in addition a full supply for every household consumer. On December 31st last coal control ended, with the current supply position excellent. I can only hope that private enterprise, which is always critical of bureaucrats, will maintain that position.

The hardships that can result from even a temporary shortage of coal are apparent in the United Kingdom today, where industry is suffering from paralysis and even domestic lighting is rationed. Lack of coal has been, and continues to be, the major deterrent in the rehabilitation of Europe. The same lack is handicapping industry in South American countries. Without constant vigilance on the part of those responsible for our continuing coal supplies, Canada may yet be in similar position. Our coal industry has a responsibility to the nation of no small magnitude.

Canada's coal is situated in Vancouver Island, in the mountain region of British Columbia, in Alberta, in southern Saskatchewan and in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Broadly speaking, the area west of the Ontario-Manitoba boundary is supplied from Canadian mines, as are the three Maritime Provinces. Western coal moves into Ontario, aided by freight subventions, but transportation limitations confine that movement to not much more than one million tons. Maritime coal, in pre-war years, moved into Quebec and Ontario, aided by freight subventions, but at present Maritime production does not exceed the amount consumed in the Maritime provinces. Thus Ontario and Quebec are almost wholly dependent for coal on United States mines. At present, Canada produces about 17 million tons of coal, and imports about 25 million tons of coal.

The urgent need for coal during the war period, and the necessity for obtaining production almost regardless of cost, has created difficult problems for our continuing peacetime coal industry. As a help in solving these problems the government, in 1944, appointed a Royal

Commission on Coal, to report on all aspects of the problems relating to coal. The report, tabled in Parliament a few days ago, represents months of careful and conscientious study by the Commissioners, and is well worth reading. The factual information that it contains is the most exhaustive yet made available. Its conclusions may not be acceptable to all, but they result from a most thorough study of Canada's coal in all its aspects.

Much has been said and written about the Canadian coal problem. This is not a single problem—we have many coal problems, differing in kind and degree. There is the problem of maintaining an adequate supply of coal for our national requirements, and there is also the problem of building up in Canada a sound and healthy producing industry. There is the problem of finding steady and adequate markets for Canadian coal, and the problem of providing reasonably full employment at fair wages for our miners. Each section of Canada has its own coal problem differing from that of other sections.

The Report of the Royal Commission on Coal accepts the necessity for industries in Central Canada to secure the major portion of their coal requirements from the United States. Developments in low cost production, and transportation, may possibly alter this concept in some measure in the future, but it would appear that, for many years, industry and households in Central Ontario will continue to secure supplies from the nearest source, namely, the immense deposits in the Appalachian field in the United States. However, this finding need not preclude the growing development of a stable and prosperous producing industry within this country, nor the provision of an increasing and remunerative field of employment for Canadian coal miners.

The Commission has found that the government policy of subventions to assist transportations of coal, arising out of investigations made by a Special Committee of the House of Commons in 1921, has been both well designed and reasonably adequate, and should be continued. This subvention policy has been directed primarily to the marketing phase of the Canadian coal industry. The problem of providing and maintaining an adequate market for Canadian coal is constantly changing, and does not, by its very nature, lend itself to the establishment of a rigid and invarying policy. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the present Dominion Fuel Board, composed of civil servants, be replaced by a new statutory body, which will serve full time in the administration of present subvention policies, and such new measures of assistance as may be required from time to time. In this way the marketing problem will receive the constant attention of a body set up for the purpose, and I do not propose to follow that phase of the matter further at present.

I will now discuss the other main problem, namely, the production of coal throughout Canada at the lowest possible cost. The report of the Commission gives the salient features of the operations in each of Canada's main coal fields. In normal times, and during the war, the industry has been in a healthy state in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, including the southeast corner of British Columbia. On the other hand, operations on Vancouver Island, and particularly in the Maritime Provinces, have not for many years been in a healthy condition. The mines producing industrial and railway coal in the mountain regions in British Columbia have had a particularly good record. The profits of the group are not excessive, but in wages paid, in constant and increasing output, and in efficiency of production, these operations stand out over the general average. The production of domestic coal in Alberta has suffered from seasonal operation, inherent in the nature of the coal, but even under this handicap, shows a sound and encouraging record. The lignite coal mines in Saskatchewan have built up by their own efforts a sound and profitable market, and have a record of expansion that is by no means ended. There are few serious problems in the operation of this section of the industry that cannot be solved by the industry itself. The provision of a stable market for the industrial and railway coals is bound up with the general prosperity of the country, but there would appear to be good prospects for the maintenance of an adequate and orderly marketing of the output from this area. The greatest improvement can be effected by developments in research that will solve the present seasonal fluctuations in the production of domestic coal in both Alberta and Saskatchewan. When the solution for this problem can be found, the freight subvention policy recommended in the Commission's report should be adequate.

The coal fields of Vancouver Island represent a special problem. The output per man day has been consistently lower than in the mountain and prairie mines, and the market has been restricted and highly competitive as against other fuels, such as oil and wood. For the past four or five years there has been a market for every ton of coal that could be produced, but, for a variety of reasons, the mines have not increased their output to meet the challenge. In fact, production has gone down, and it has been necessary to sustain operations by means of production subsidies. The ending of production subsidies, which cannot be long delayed, will call for a reorganized production programme, required to maintain a sound and healthy coal producing industry on Vancouver Island.

A still more serious outlook is presented by present conditions in the Maritime Provinces, and particularly in the Cape Breton area. We have here the largest concentration of the Canadian coal mining industry, located in a heavily populated area that is almost wholly dependent on this industry for means of livelihood. The other large Maritime industry, steel, depends for its well being upon an adequate supply of coal, at a cost that will permit the sale of its products at competitive prices. Maximum production from the Maritime coal fields has been a matter of national necessity during the two great wars within our generation. Thus the Maritime coal problem is of the highest importance, not only to that locality, but to all parts of Canada.

Mining has been carried on continuously in the Cape Breton field for a longer period than in any other Canadian area, and part of the problem arises from the technical difficulties, inherent both in the nature of the deposits, and in the very fact that mining operations have continued along lines laid down years ago. The methods adapted to mining of coal in earlier years may not be best adapted to the present situation. The Royal Commission Report devotes considerable space to mining methods in these areas.

There is evident in the Cape Breton area a social problem that has a definite effect on coal production. This is the concentration, in a comparatively restricted area, of a large population depending almost wholly on the coal industry, and its partner the steel industry, for a livelihood. While many Cape Bretoners have migrated to other parts of Canada, there has been a steady pressure on the labour market for employment in coal or steel, except in war years. It is reasonable to believe that in this situation may lie the root causes of some of the undesirable trends in labour relations in this field. Wage rates in the mining industries in Cape Breton have been in the past consistently lower than in the United States or in Western Canada. These lower wage rates, together with the advantage of a cheap water haul to the St. Lawrence River market, permitted substantial marketing in Ontario and Quebec, in the years before the war, in competition with United States coal, even though the production in Cape Breton per man day of some 2½ tons was considerably lower than the competitive U. S. figure of about five tons per man day. The Royal Commission Report states that competent engineers report that an output of 3½ tons per man day can be realized in the chief mines of this area under proper conditions. These conditions stem back to a sound and mutually trustful relationship between labour and management. It would appear from the report that only through the development of that relationship can a prosperous industry and a self-supporting community be created and maintained.

The production of coal in the Maritime Provinces since early in the war has presented an increasingly difficult and distressing problem. Production in this area has dropped by over two million tons per annum from normal, and the cost of production has skyrocketted to the point that the Federal Government has been obliged to provide upwards of twenty million dollars to the mine owners since January 1st, 1942, in production subsidies, to prevent the industry from collapsing. The operators have placed the blame for decreased efficiency and higher cost of labour, and in turn, labour has been very critical of the management.

Canada is fast approaching the time when special production subsidies no longer can be justified. The Royal Commission recommends the ending of production subsidies, but two of the Commissioners suggest continued Government aid to the Maritime industry for a short reconversion period. The report is definite in its indication that the industry must expect to stand on its own feet, except for enlargements of its markets through freight subventions. Unless increased production can be obtained, subvention assistance is likely to be of little benefit, as production of coal and its consumption are at present about in balance within the Maritime Provinces.

During the war period there have been significant increases in the wage rates of labour, and, because of full working time, the total weekly and annual earning of labour have increased even more. Certain increases in labour rates have been compensated for by increased selling prices, and Maritime coal at the present price scale remains in about the same competitive position as at the outbreak of war. This present price scale, however, is only maintained by the payment of heavy production subsidies. From a labour cost of $2.00 per ton in 1939, labour cost had risen to $4.14 per ton in 1944. The reason for this lies in the fact that the output of coal per man day in 1939 was 2.70 net tons, which in 1944 had fallen to 1.70 net tons, a clear loss of one ton of coal per man day worked and paid for. Had the pre-war rate of output been maintained, the 1,950,000 odd man days worked in 1944 would have produced 1,950,000 more tons of coal, which would have produced some $8,970,000 additional revenue, and obviated the necessity of any subsidy. In addition, the pre-war production rate would provide for the wage increase the workers are demanding at this moment.

In the emergency of war, there may have been justification for the payment of production subsidies on the scale I have mentioned, but it is unrealistic to contemplate the maintenance of such payments into the future. There is unanimity on this point in the recommendations of the Commissioners, even though it is proposed by two of the Commissioners that some payment should continue for a short interim period. The cessation of assistance from public funds will, under present conditions require an immediate increase in price, but while some increase can possibly be realized in some areas, the higher prices will inevitably contract the market, cut down output and reduce working time.

In pre-war years wages for coal miners in the Maritime Provinces have been lower than in other fields, and the necessity for this disparity was recognized and accepted. It is, however, an unsound policy to attempt to perpetuate an industry through low wages. Therefore, every effort must be exerted to provide, through a return to low cost and efficient production, for the payment of wages that will return a fair and reasonable standard of living to the workers. We are faced with the outstanding fact that, if production in the mines were brought up only as far as the pre-war level of efficiency, the present difficulty would fade and disappear. Such an improvement would provide for the elimination of the present production subsidy and for increases in wage scale, as well as for surplus available to management for necessary mine improvements. The fact is noted in the coal report that one mining operation in this area, operating with the same type of labour, in the same coal seams, and under the same conditions, has been able to maintain output efficiency and operate without subsidy, throughout the war period.

I have said that a return of pre-war efficiency in output would solve the immediate situation, which is true, but the thorough rehabilitation of this area requires even higher output rates. The coal report presents expert opinions that a production rate of 3½ tons per man day should be possible. Production at the rate of 3½ tons per man day would protect the industry against a drop in competitive coal prices, and would permit the industry to look forward with confidence to a stable and reasonably prosperous future. The objective can be attained only through the closest and most whole-hearted co-operation between management and labour, and by the preparation and consistent pursuit of a competent and inclusive plan of operation. The reinvigoration of the industry, once accomplished, would provide inducement for the entry into coal mining of young men, to supplement the labour of those older men who now represent the larger part of the working forces.

I would sum up the Maritime situation by saying that, unless the problems facing the industry are quickly solved, the industry is heading for disaster. All parties concerned must adopt a new attitude and both labour and management must forget ancient grievances and disputes. The problem of restoring the coal industry of the Maritime Provinces to a healthy condition is wrapped up with the continued prosperity of the area, and constitutes a plain challenge to private enterprise, as it is also a challenge to organized labour.

The coal report concludes with both majority and minority recommendations, but it is interesting to note that there is in fact a substantial measure of unanimity. All Commissioners have agreed that it is not practical to contemplate an all-Canadian coal supply, and that the continued importation of coal from the United States will be necessary. There is agreement that this should not preclude the maintenance of a coal producing industry in Canada, upon a level that will afford a reasonable prosperity to the operators, a fair level of employment and wages to labour, and some assurance of adequate coal supply to the nation. There is agreement with the policy of assisting Canadian coal to find a wider market by means of subventions and the present tariff, as that policy has been developed and administered in the past, is sound, and should be continued, although there are some small differences of opinion as to the future scope of the policy. The Commissioners are unanimous in the opinion that nationalization of the industry, in whole or in part, does not offer any promise of improvement over present conditions. There is agreement that a Statutory Board should be established, to carry on the functions of the Dominion Fuel Board, and to assume additional responsibilities in the national interest.

Returning to the supply problem in Ontario and Quebec, geography and economics make it inevitable that these provinces must depend largely on imported coal. Thus the supply is subject to interruptions beyond the control of Canada. We had an example last summer, when you will recall that a protracted coal strike in the United States was followed by a protracted seaman's strike in Canada. Strikes in the steel industry in the United States, and later in Canada, curtailed our normal supplies of coke. The combined result was that at September 1st our imports were three and one-half million tons lower for that period than would supply our minimum requirements. I had every reason to fear that Canada would face a situation this winter similar to the present situation in the United Kingdom. However, the Coal Controller and his staff combined with the Canadian Shipping Board, both of which had war emergency powers, in a determined effort to correct the situation. Lake carriers were taken out of their normal trades, and diverted to the carriage of coal. Emergency arrangements were made to transport Alberta coal to Ontario markets, and to move American coal by rail into this area. The result was that the close of navigation found us with our minimum requirements provided for, plus one and one-half million tons of bituminous coal, and one million tons of anthracite coal, as an additional cushion against further interruptions to supply. This correction could not have been made without the agency of over-riding emergency powers. If, in future, Ontario and Quebec is to have reasonable security of coal supply, it seems necessary that the new statutory board must be clothed with emergency adequate to enable that Board to deal quickly with any situation that may arise.

I offer this analysis of Canada's coal problem, based on the recently published report of the Royal Commission on Coal, with the thought that responsible Canadians who are not likely to read the report should have some knowledge of its contents. Whether he knows it or not, the well being of every Canadian citizen can be affected by coal. Looking back over the period of coal control, it seems to me that we have been more fortunate than we had any right to expect. Had any one of a number of impending disasters to our coal supply actually occurred, Canada's war time experience could have been changed greatly for the worse. The future years may not be as fortunate, and for that reason, if for no other, the joint problem of Canada's coal supply, and the well being of our coal industry, deserves the thoughtful consideration of every Canadian citizen.

I hope that I have made some small contribution to your basic information on this subject.

"IRAN'S CURRENT PROBLEMS"

AN ADDRESS BY

PROFESSOR T. CUYLER YOUNG, M.A., Th.B.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, February 20, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and Ladies and Gentlemen of our air audience:

One evening, just about dusk, *Prime Minister Clement Atlee,* while crossing Westminster Bridge, was horrified to see a man climbing over the rail with the very evident intention of leaping to his death in the Thames. Rushing forward he grabbed the man by the coat-tail and pulled him back to safety. Imagine his astonishment when he found the would-be suicide was his own *Minister for Foreign Affairs. "Oh! My dear chap—you can't do that—whatever is the matter?"* And the minister for foreign affairs replied that he was utterly despondent—he felt that he had finally reached the point where a continuation of life seemed positively futile: As he looked about the world—Europe—Asia—India—Palestine and the Far East—all seemed utter confusion: There seemed to be no answer to the complex riddle and no hope for mankind. *"Oh", Mr. Atlee said—"Come now, it surely can't be as bad as all that. Now I tell you what we'll do—Let you and I sit down and discuss this matter like two sensible people—and if at the conclusion you still feel as you do and are determined to destroy yourself, I'll agree not to restrain you".* So they sat down and talked the matter over for five minutes—*and then they both climbed over the rail and jumped in together.*

The economic and diplomatic complexities at many points of the world today must seem at times to you as they do to me—to be almost beyond the point of solution in spite of the arduous endeavours of our Administrators —Diplomats and Statesmen. One of these trouble spots has been Iran—one of the oldest independent Kingdoms in the World. No one knows how many thousands of years ago Iran (or Persia) was first populated. It is claimed by some that the Garden of Eden was in Persia. It is said that there is not a square foot of that country that does not bear some relic or scar of the stirring events which have swept over it for centuries. It has been recurrently both a conquered and a conquering nation and the scene of some of the greatest battles of medieval history. Persia may be said to have been the Cradle of arts, Culture and Democratic laws. For many centuries it proved a very disputed territory, in fact, only within our lifetime have the Russian and British Empires—whose possessions touch Iran on the N. and E., agreed that its independence shall be respected and even that agreement made (I believe) only 33 years ago seems to have proven controversial in the light of more recent history.

Our guest speaker today is an outstanding authority on the Far East and Iran in particular. Born in Pennsylvania, educated at the College of Wooster—a Graduate of Princeton University—Graduate of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago—for eight years a Missionary in Iran—and presently occupying the chair of Oriental Languages at Victoria University—Prof. Young has been a student and a mentor on the far eastern situation for a lifetime. During the last war he was appointed special technical adviser on Iranian problems in the Div. of Special Information, Dept. of Strategic Services in Washington and later as Public Relations Officer of the American Embassy at Teheran.

It is my pleasure to introduce to you *Prof. T. Cuyler Young, B.A., M.A., Th.B.,* who will tell us about—*"Iran's Current Problems".*

PROF. T. CUYLER YOUNG: Mr. President, Gentlemen of The Empire Club of Canada, and those of you beyond on the air throughout the Dominion:

I count it a privilege and an honour to be here today to share with you something of my experiences of recent years in connection with Iran, when it has been my privilege to have go over my desk, for at least two years, all the Intelligence on political and economic matters gathered by most civil and military agencies of the American Government, and by many of those of the British Government; and when for almost that period in more recent times I was in Iran itself.

With so much of a story to tell, you will pardon me for immediately jumping into the subject and sketching for you in broad outline something of the immediate background for the understanding of the current problems of modern Iran.

For a century and a half this country has been caught between the grinding millstones of imperial power, between the Russian Bear and the British Lion, to the north and to the south. Over a century of such rivalry eventually culminated in the Agreement of 1907, which guaranteed the independence of this country, and proceeded at the same time to carve out spheres of economic influence in the country, these two great powers coming together in Asia to meet the common threat of Germany in Europe.

The peace did not last long. Iran was a marginal battlefield in the war that followed, and immediately thereafter the picture changed. The Soviets withdrew into their own territory to take care of their own upheaval and revolution and satisfied themselves— to use a Stalinist phrase—with "harrassing the Imperialist rear in Asia"; while Iran almost fell into the orbit of the British Empire as a satellite state, and only avoided that by the rise of a new national spirit and movement which was spearheaded by a military officer risen from the ranks—Reza Khan, the founder of a new dynasty in Iran in 1925.

In the subsequent decade and a half of his reign he endeavoured to modernize this ancient country, and enable it to take its place in the modern family of nations. He did two things for the country, internally and externally. Domestically, he organized the country into a strong central state with ordered industrial development and increasing social reforms. Externally, he made the

Iranians independent as related to their ancient rivals to the north and to the south, following what amounted to an anti-Soviet policy, whose Bolshevism he both hated and feared, and what was tantamount to a pro-British policy, although actually more than once he twisted the Lion's tail during that time. But that policy the British tolerated and accepted because of the end result of creating a strong buffer state between Russia and India.

The Shah could scarcely be blamed for not foreseeing that this playing of the two ends against the middle in the traditional pattern of Iranian policy would eventually end in disaster, for not many of us foresaw that again the Russian Bear and the British Lion would march together as they did in the summer of 1941. When Nazi Germany attacked Iran that country furnished the only land bridge of comparative security over which these two great Allies could communicate with each other and when neutral Iran refused the demands of Moscow and London, the armies of Russia and Britain occupied the country in August 1941 and regularized their position in the following January by the signing of a Tripartite Treaty in which the Powers, in exchange for the control of internal communications and foreign affairs, promised to withdraw all their occupying troops six months after the cessation of hostilities or the signing of the Peace, whichever should be earlier—which has a rather strange sound in 1947.

By this time the United States had entered the war and had become part of the picture in Iran; by the end of 1942 the Persian Gulf Service Command was organized and 30,000 G.I.s were sent into the country to reorganize and rebuild the ports, the railways and the highways for the forwarding in the subsequent years of almost four and a half million tons of supplies into Russia, to turn the tide of battle in Eastern Europe.

During that period the relationship of these three powers to each other and of each to Iran are of some interest in understanding the problem.

The Russians and the British eyed each other with considerable suspicion, that suspicion probably greater on the part of the Soviets who refused to allow the citizens or the officials of any other country to go about in the northern occupied provinces of Iran without a special visa issued by the Tehran Soviet Embassy. This rivalry was marked, of course, by correctness but by a lack of cordiality between the representatives of these powers during this period. The Russians also remained considerably aloof from the Americans, although relations between their representatives, particularly on the working level were much more cordial than between the Soviets and the British.

As might be expected, in the prosecution of a common task the Tommies and the G.I.s and their officers worked rather closely together.

In relation to Iran itself these powers followed divergent policies.

As for the British, it is not surprising to discover that the Iranians regarded them with their long-acquired suspicion. Indeed, it might be said that both these powers, the Russians and the British, are regarded by the Iranians with hate and fear, with the former dominating their relationship with the British, and the latter uppermost in their relations with the Russians. The Russian Army was excellently disciplined. It interfered little, as did Soviet officials, in the affairs of the Iranian people at the working level in the provinces; and the Iranians discovered that much of the fear that they had held for their neighbours of the north had been dispelled by these excellent relations.

On the higher levels of policy-making, however, the Soviet officials were more obvious and ruthless, demanding certain agreements with the Iranian Government that amounted to Lend-Lease on behalf of the great neighbour of the North who was defending them against the common enemy.

The Iranians continued to be very suspicious of the British for they are practically pathological on the subject of British interference and their shrewd, subtle intrigue within the country. I tell my Iranian friends that they are so bad on the subject that if anything untoward goes wrong with the weather they are sure to blame it upon the British. This comes because of the rivalry of these powers across so many years, and particularly because in the last generation or two the Iranians feel that the British have let them down in their 19th century defence of them against the encroachments of Russia.

The Iranians got a new idea of Americans because of the experience during these war years. They were and still are anxious to draw this third great power into the Iranian scene in order that it may serve as a balance in the age-old rivalry of power in that part of the world. Previously the Iranians had generally known missionaries, diplomats, and business men, and they got a new idea of Americans when they saw 30,000 soldiers and airmen from all over the United States living within their country. Although one might say that they were disillusioned as to the character of the Americans of the distant new world, their conceptions could be put on a more realistic basis in the future. Two important impressions emerged from that experience. First, they saw in this G.I. a certain vital buoyant spirit of real democracy; and secondly they perceived and got an impression of tremendous industrial power and wealth, as evidenced in the American war effort in that part of the world.

Now, the relations of these powers to each other in this strategic area, for such it is, are of considerable importance. If you will look at the world you will observe that the near and immediate East is a very strategic area from the point of view of economics—the communications involved on a global scale, and the tremendous oil resources that are to be found in that area. The crossroads of the air and of the land and of the sea are to be found in the near and Middle East, and the most fabulous potential oil resources in the world erupt as black gold from beneath that land bridge of the continents.

The relationships of these powers during these recent years are well symbolized in the first meeting of the Big

Three in Tehran, when Churchill, Stalin and Roosevelt not only issued their first common military communique looking toward unconditional surrender, but signed the Tehran Declaration in which was guaranteed the integrity of Iran and aid of an economic nature to this country which was furnishing what in that part of the world was known as the "land bridge of victory" at some considerable price, and suffering along economic lines because of inflation, a dislocated economy, military efforts within the country and tremendous spending; and the gap that had always been great between the masses of the poor and the few privileged classes at the top, become wider with the rich growing richer and the poor growing poorer.

The story of this area since the signing of that Declaration is of considerable interest in discovering not only how these powers, the Big Three, continued together on this "land bridge of Asiatic victory" in a military way, but in the building of the peace that was to follow.

It is not surprising that the initial point of departure for this struggle toward a new cooperation in the building of the peace should be the struggle for oil. For two years ago this last summer, the representatives of the British and American oil companies were in the country, trying to secure oil concessions in the south-eastern part of the land, bordering on India and the Persian Gulf.

Then in to this picture came the Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs from Moscow, demanding sweeping exploration and exploitation rights of petroleum in the northern provinces bordering upon Russia.

At this point let me make it clear that at no time in recent years, previous decades excepted, have any American or British companies even thought, let alone tried, to secure oil concessions in the northern part of Iran. Nor have their governments at any time encouraged them to do so, or have they at any time expressed themselves as opposed to the Soviet Union developing those oil resources if the Iranians wished foreign capital and skill so to develop them. This is important, in view of considerable propaganda to the contrary.

The Iranian Parliament, which eventually has to approve all such agreements, got frightened at this Soviet request and passed a law making it illegal for any representative of the Iranian Government even to talk about oil with representatives of a foreign company or power until after the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Iranian soil. The British and American Governments declared that Iran in so decreeing was within its sovereign rights. The Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs from Moscow, however, frustrated in his attempt, left Tehran telling a few of my acquaintances that "You Iranians will rue the day you have made this decision for we shall find means of bringing pressure to gain our ends."

Such means were at their disposal. The chief means was the Tudeh (Masses) Party, which they proceeded to arouse to new life in order to influence the elections of the next National Assembly.

Now, to be sure, in doing so they had a very good example set them in the previous election, for had not the British of the south assured that the Russians in the north would, of course, use this party for the backing of the Leftists—seen to it that the friends of Britain were elected from the southern Provinces? So the Soviets proceeded to use this means at hand to their best advantage.

I wish I could talk all of the time about the Tudeh Party. I can only here point out one or two facts. The Party came into being with the removal of the dictatorial regime of Reza Shah after the occupation of the powers in 1941, its leaders emerging from jail where they had languished for many years. Now the published platform of their immediately organized Leftist Socialist Party would scarcely turn a hair of the members of the Labour Government, or the C.C.F. Party in this Dominion. At the center of this party, however, was a hard core of Communists, some of whom had been trained in the schools of their neighbours to the north, and it is not by the published platform, but by the actual performance of this party since two years ago last summer that one must judge them; for, since that time the party has unfailingly followed a pro-Communist, pro-Moscow line in all internal and external affairs.

The National Assembly, dominated—as previously suggested by pro-British deputies and again scared of this move of their powerful neighbours to the north, proceeded to pass another law, declaring that it would be illegal to hold a national election in Iran until all foreign troops were withdrawn from Iranian soil.

Frustrated in this direction, the Soviets turned to another. If you will look at the map of Iran, you will notice that it is a crouching Persian cat in the middle of *Asia,* bearing the Caspian Sea on its back, with Afghanistan and India to the rear, lying on the Persian Gulf, with its head and ears sticking straight up into the Caucasus and Russia; and that head is the Province of Azerbaijan, which is the largest, the wealthiest, the most populous province of the whole country, the economy of which elsewhere always responds to the state of the economic conditions prevailing in the Azerbaijan capital of Tabriz.

So it was the simple procedure of strangling the cat in order to make it come to terms, and a year ago last fall, a so-called indigenous revolution of the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan suddenly occurred in that province. The Tudeh Party, which up to this time—for all the benevolent and benign cooperation afforded by the Soviet officials—had muddled along and not gone very far, was suddenly galvanized into new power. It had its name changed and obviously was directed by a new shrewd leadership that moved quickly across the weeks to a new goal.

It was my privilege to spend one of the most interesting weeks of my life a year ago last December in the last week of this revolution and to witness how such a revolution is consummated and how power is transferred bloodlessly from one group to another.

Ironically enough, I was flown to Tabriz in a Russian plane and returned on the day that Tabriz was taken by the recently organized provincial militia, on the very day that the new Provincial Assembly was constituted.

During that week it was my privilege to talk with a great variety of citizens, officials and groups of the regular Iranian Government, civil and military; as well as to have long sessions with the rebel leaders, and a sampling of opinion of various strata of society, the last of which was only possible under the cover of night or the equivalent by day, so terrorized was the town. The leaders of the rebellion frankly told me that they had accomplished what they had only because of the support of the occupying Soviet troops.

I came away from that week with conviction centering around two things. First of all, that there was social unrest of a real character and legitimate complaints against the central government of Tehran on the part of the suffering Province of Azerbaijan. The Tehran Government, however, had a heritage of the recent years of Pahlavi dictatorship which they had had no opportunity during foreign occupation to attack or change in any way. Secondly, I was convinced from all this that the majority of the people of the province denied that these particular leaders were their chosen voices for the articulation of this complaint against their central government. Subsequent events of the year thereafter have proven those two things to be true.

The pressure brought to bear upon the Iranian situation, however, was such that the Government in Tehran had to resign. To the Premiership then came Ahmad Qavam, the only man of leadership stature with whom the Russians would talk, who continued the complaints before the United Nations, in the first assembly in London, and who went personally to Moscow to try to arrange a deal himself. So stiff were the terms that he returned empty-handed.

The date was March the 2nd when the Soviets had promised to withdraw all their troops. United States troops had been withdrawn the 1st of January. All British troops were withdrawn on the 2nd of March. Many of us had said that whatever else the Soviets might do, they would abide by their sworn treaty; but they let us down: they did not withdraw their troops but poured in more of an armoured character. They must have been quite surprised when Washington publicly advertised this fact to the world.

During the third week of March when the Iranians celebrate their New Year—the only logical time to celebrate a New Year—and when they declare a five day holiday and everybody is out for a gala time, we were sitting on top of dynamite in Tehran, not knowing which way the Russians might choose to move, whether we might have the kind of a situation where the "Democrats" from Azerbaijan would march on the government of Tehran where there would be a mass rising within the city to establish a new government, "a people's government," "friendly to the Soviet" and recognized as such; or whether the Soviet would choose to bow to the pressure in the Security Council and to choose the long range game of influencing persons and parties within Iran and abiding its time to reach its goal.

We know that it chose the latter. Premier Qavam—under pressure on the spot—made an agreement, promising the oil exploitation and development to the Soviets, in exchange for the withdrawal of Soviet troops on the 6th of May, and the promise that the Soviets would bring their moral suasive power to bear on the rebels in Azerbaijan to come to terms with the central government in Tehran.

The troops were withdrawn but Soviet moral suasive powers on the Azerbaijan leaders were not quite as forceful as other influences that had been exercised the previous December, for when Azerbaijan made an agreement with the central government in the following June it was on a considerably different basis than the seven points that had been promised by the Soviets in March. It was marked by the condition of a pro-Soviet and a pro-Tudeh policy on the part of the Premier, Qavam having taken into his Cabinet three members of this party, and having raised one of his pro-Soviet Ministers to the position of Vice-Premier. This person was really the spearhead of this whole movement, and, I am prepared to say, a stooge of the northern neighbours.

The turning point came with the crisis in the oil fields of Southwestern Iran, when the Tudeh Party, striving for control, quickly tried to organize the oilfields and when in a two-day melee they almost got control of the situation there, and were only prevented when Premier Qavam ordered the Iranian Army into the area to keep order and when the British brought up a crack division from India, to sit on the other side of the nearby Iranian border. The pro-Soviet policy continued until the fall when there was a rebellion in the south on the part of the tribes who demanded the same kind of autonomous arrangement for the southern provinces that had been given to Azerbaijan.

Most Iranians, of course, believed that this was the work of the British, now busy at last. It was not so much that, as the fact that the very survival of these tribes and their importance in the south demanded an anti-Soviet policy at this juncture. This coincided with a pro-British policy. I believe that it can be said for the Labour Government in Britain that they are sincerely trying to turn a right hand corner and to refrain from internal interference in the affairs of Iran. To be sure, when such interests as those of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company are threatened, perhaps the temptation might be too much. But nonetheless, that is the attempt and that is the policy at the present time, I believe; and London was able to convince Premier Qavam that British officials had not been involved in that southern rebellion.

The result of this tribal pressure was such that the Qavam Government turned toward the right, in order to appease the forces of the south, at just that time when preparations were being made for the coming national elections and when political affairs within the country were such that Premier Qavam believed he was being double-crossed by his Tudeh friends, perhaps being taken into camp, and himself not able to take them into camp as of course he possibly expected. At the same time, coincident with that, the Shah took a strong line and let it be known he would perhaps exercise his constitutional right of dismissing his Premier and calling another to head the government if a new line were not followed. We discover that Qavam threw in his weight with the Shah and the army, which was behind His Majesty and against the previous appeasement of the Tudeh and the Soviets.

To be brief and to come to the crisis more quickly, In the coming struggle for political control, one must, of course, realize that, in a country where there is 85 to 90 per cent illiteracy, elections are the delivery of blocs of votes by great landlords and merchant princes; and where such things can be arranged, success can be had if only one can achieve a national organization. Premier Qavam developed his own Democratic Party of Iran to the point where it might contest with the other nationally organized party of the Tudeh.

Demanding—as has always been the custom in Iran—that the forces of security might supervise the elections, and sending those forces into the little province of Khamseh to the east of Azerbaijan, which they had agreed to return to the central government the previous June but had failed to implement, Qavam and the Shah discovered that the army was welcomed by the open arms of the people, rising as one to oust their previous leaders.

Encouraged by this, in spite of the strongest diplomatic representations on the part of the Soviet, all political means having failed to bring Azerbaijan agreement eventually they sent their troops into Azerbaijan itself, and in 48 hours the whole regime had collapsed with the people welcoming the army with open arms, and as one all over the Province; before the army got there, taking advantage of the situation, rising and liquidating in many cases these so-called "Democratic" leaders, who they had discovered in the previous year and a day of their rule had not so much been sincerely interested in the complaints and the unrest of the masses of the Azerbaijanian as in exploiting the situation for the benefit of a foreign power, and who were willing to accept the Iranian army, saying they would rather do business with, and be governed by, known devils in Tehran than unknown angels in Moscow.

The result was that immediately the situation changed over night. I wish I had time to tell you of some of the more significant and dramatic events concerned with that. The situation in Kurdistan, the Republic that had been founded down there, and the efforts of the leaders for months before that to get out from under this agreement that they had brought upon themselves; the interview between the Soviet Ambassador and His Majesty, the Shah, in which the Shah knew that the Azerbaijanian and Democratic Party leaders had a few hours before abdicated and fled for Russia with the Ambassador still ignorant of that fact; the subsequent effort of the Tudeh to try to salvage the situation, only to discover that public opinion, not only official but of the great masses of the people, had suddenly risen in revulsion against them, so that in subsesuent days they had to go underground. In the intervening period the Soviets have closed Consulates throughout Southern Iran, reduced their investments and their personnel along trade and cultural propaganda lines in Northern Iran; for this there seems to be no other interpretation than that for the present they have decided it is too expensive a venture and have written it off until some future date.

I wish I had time to discuss the reports that come from Iran and that indicate to us, to use the words of one report, that every man, woman and child in Azerbaijan were behind the democratic party"—a statement which is nothing short of ridiculous—and that the great majority of the people in Iran are behind the Tudeh, and are only suppressed by the tyranny of the Iranian Army.

Do not misunderstand me. There is dynamic social unrest in Iran, there is a feudal system of land tenure, an anachronism in this modern world which must disappear and there is exploitation of the masses. The situation may in the future at some time be expressed as reported; but at the present time it is a false distortion of the picture so to present it.

The result of all this is that only the first round in the struggle for cooperation of the Big Three in Iran is finished. It has been finished by the guarantee to Iran of their independence and integrity and a new opportunity to put their house in order.

And do not think that the Iranians have lost the significance of it. For the illiterate peasants lining the highways of Azerbaijan, welcoming the incoming Iranian Army did it with Hurrahs—"Long Live the Security Council and the United States."

For I am proud to say it has been my country during the last year and a half that has carried the ball in defence of the independence and integrity of Iran. I grant you that it is not wholly from altruistic motives, but from an enlightened self-interest and a vital concern in that part of the world as an area where perhaps peace may be threatened and where there may be tension and trouble between the great powers.

Yet the western democracies have but secured the opportunity of leadership and organization of peace upon a sound basis in that part of the world. For I am sure of this: If that is not followed by a real policy—and in this I speak of the announced policy of the United States Government—for building up of a strong, independent, progressive, democratic, prosperous Iran, as well as other such states in the Middle East; if there is not an implementation of that policy along the lines of real political and economic democracy, then the day of reckoning and of trouble and of tension in that great strategic and explosive part of the world has been but postponed.

There now lies before the Western Powers in that part of the world an unequalled opportunity. Time is short and it depends upon the vision and the understanding of the citizens of these western democracies, and in particular those in the capitalistic system of this continent, to demonstrate that they are equal to the privileges that are now theirs in leadership in the Near and Middle East. For, if we cannot give to these people in the development of their resources a fair equal partnership in that whole enterprise and see to it that the results and the profits of the exploitation of those resources are spent for the benefit of the people, the masses, the raising of the standards of living and of health and of education of the masses of this part of the world, eventually this dynamism that is working among the masses of the Near and Middle East will erupt into a new explosion with which we shall have to reckon in the future.

Do not misunderstand me. I am not anti-Soviet. I am no Communist. But I do believe we must be realistic in our relationships with our erstwhile Allies in this part of the world, that we must call a spade a spade, be ever aware of what is going on, be realistic in a patient but firm policy with the demonstration of power behind our intent, and with the determination that we shall come through to a cooperation with our Soviet friends in the building of a new world peace.

To give that up is to lose the peace at the very beginning. And in this area the issue may eventually be joined for it is complex and explosive in character. Here is the cradle of our civilization. God forbid that it might be the point at which the bomb would explode that would shatter that civilization to bits.

"THE CONDITION OF CIVILIANS IN WESTERN EUROPE AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE GERMAN OCCUPATION"

AN ADDRESS BY

WING COMMANDER JOHN F. McCREARY, M.D., R.C.A.F.

Thursday, February 27, 1947

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air—

Our meeting today will be somewhat unique in that our guest speaker has come equipped with a projector to show some pictures he took personally while with the army in Germany—which pictures he will use to illustrate certain features in his talk. However, may I say to those listening on the air—do not turn off your radio in the belief that this is to be a picture show, for that is not the case. There will be a few pictures only and Dr. McCreary will explain and describe each one for your better understanding.

The first step on a large scale to feed the people of occupied Europe came on April 30th, 1945, following a conference held the day before between Field Marshal Montgomery's Headquarters and the General Commanding the 25th German Army. It was agreed that the Swedish Red Cross would assume the responsibility of distribution of the rations and that day the Canadian Corps moved forward 240 lorries containing 100 tons of food and delivered it inside the German lines, under truce. The Dutch civilians handled the unloading with extreme difficulty as in their weakened condition, attributable to malnutrition, a man of normally excellent physique would collapse after a half hour of this manual labour. This will give some idea of the difficulties which followed as the necessity arose of not only feeding nearly fifty thousand Dutch civilians in the British area, but hundreds of thousands of released prisoners and others known as "misplaced personnel"—As the Allied Forces moved further into Germany. The need for those experienced in dietetics as well as in medicine was immediately indicated and at that point Dr. McCreary—an authority of international repute in dietetics—was sent forward to survey the situation, to report and (more important) to *act,* so that those suffering humans might secure the maximum in hunger relief and medical attention with a minimum loss of time.

Wing Comm. McCreary is a Graduate in Medicine of our own University of Toronto. Prior to joining the R.C.A.F. early in the war, he practised in Toronto. He served overseas in the Air Force until called to Supreme Allied Headquarters in 1945 to assume special duties in relation to the health of civilians in the occupied areas. His excellent work in this office merited the highest acclaim and the Dutch Government honoured him by making him an Officer of the Order of Orange—Nassau.

It is my pleasure to introduce—

WING COMM. JOHN F. MCCREARY, M.D., who will tell us about "The Condition of Civilians in W. Europe at the Conclusion of the German Occupation".

WING. COMM. JOHN F. MCCREARY, M.D.: Mr. President, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: As has been stated, it was my very good fortune to be one of a group whose task it was to examine the civilians in Occupied Europe in an attempt to evaluate their state of health at the conclusion of the German Occupation.

We did most of our work in Western Holland, for reasons which I think will become clear during the course of this discussion. We had an opportunity of doing some work in the Brussels region of Belgium. We did no examinations whatever in France, so whatever I may have to say about that country will be based entirely upon reports of other groups doing the same work in that area.

We had an opportunity of visiting some of the concentration camps within Germany, and I should like to have a few words to say about these later on.

Now, it is obvious it would be ridiculous for me in the time at one's disposal this afternoon to attempt to describe all features of life under Nazi Occupation for the various population groups in Western Europe. One must select some particular aspect of the subject to discuss and I am going to discuss the question of food. How much food did these people actually get? How much harm did lack of food actually do to them?

It doesn't require any very lengthy consideration of the subject to realize that an area as large as Western Europe would have a good deal of variation in the degree of hardships occasioned by lack of food. The three main factors involved by lack of food under the Nazi regime were:

(1) The amount of food which the Germans moved back into their own country for their own population.

(2) The shortage of manpower for planting and harvesting crops.

(3) And, by all odds most important, the breakdown in transport, particularly in the latter years of the war, which resulted in food being left in the areas where it was grown rather than being transported to the areas where it was ordinarily consumed. As a result of this last factor, the people in the agricultural areas of Western Europe probably were as well off as they had ever been. To be sure, they did not get the variety of food. It was impossible to import food with which to dilute their product but they certainly had plenty of food to eat and no nutritional problems developed in these areas.

If we leave out these last groups we find that three relatively clear cut grades of nutritional deficiencies existed in the population of Western Europe under the German occupation. The first was that that occurred in the large European centres, in France and Belgium, and it is with this group I should like to spend a little time at first. I am going to discuss Brussels largely because we had an opportunity of examining people in Brussels and because, more important, we had an opportunity of going through their Public Health records and knowing exactly what they did, what they had to eat in the way of legal rations and what illnesses were reported during the period when rations were at the most severe state.

At Brussels, as in other cities in Western Europe, there was plenty of food at the beginning of the German occupation. These people had seen war coming, they had built up stocks of food, and were relatively well off at that time. However, so energetic had the German army proven themselves in exporting food back to their own country that within a few months of the German occupation it was necessary to impose the first war time ration in the Brussels area. That first ration was a relatively generous one. It contained about 2200 calories as based on the 3000 calories which most of us eat in this country. It contained adequate amounts of fat and proteins and had it been maintained throughout the entire occupation there would have been no nutritional troubles of any sort. However it was not maintained so very long and within two months the ration was reduced.

Early in 1941 it was reduced again, and in July of 1941 it suffered a third reduction and finally in November of 1941 it reached the basal level which was maintained throughout the remainder of the German occupation. This vital ration was anything but generous. It provided 1200 calories as compared to our 3000. It provided by any set of standards an inadequate amount of proteins and fat.

What happened to the people of Brussels on this ration? Well, in order to try and answer that question I am going to quote to you from the Public Health records of that country for the blackest winter of all these people had to put in, the winter of 1941-42, and during that winter every single individual in Brussels was hungry. There simply wasn't enough food to fill their stomachs. Everybody lost weight, and the amount of weight lost depended in large part on the age of the individual. Newborn babies were born weighing within a fraction of an ounce of what they had weighed in the prewar years, despite the fact that their mothers might be 20% under weight. Weight again was relatively normal the first year of life because milk was the main commodity in the diet and the milk was set aside for young infants.

Then between one year and twelve and thirteen years of age, the discrepancy in the weight attaind in the age group and those attained in the prewar period increased at 12 years of age the average little girl in Brussels in 1941 and 1942 weighed 15 pounds less than the average youngster did in the prewar years.

Then there was an unexplained trend back toward normal coincident with the onset of adolescence and puberty and between the ages of 12 to 17 years of age there was a trend back toward the normal weight. This is simply unexplained. They didn't receive any extra food during that period but it looks as though perhaps increased assimilation of food during that time. It was most marked in the case of the girls, and also noticeable in the case of the boys.

Then with that out of the way, the loss in weight gradually became more marked with advancing age until in the case of people of very obese in prewar years, the losses in weight are 75 to 100 pounds ordinarily.

Every single person in Brussels that winter was tired. Their basal metabolic rate according to studies made by their own scientists were about 12% lower than in prewar years. They needed more sleep, they required more rest, they simply could not produce the amount of work which they had formerly been able to produce in prewar years.

The incidence of infectious diseases rose rapidly, not, I am sure, directly as a result of the lack of food, but more particularly as a result of lack of shelter, lack of accommodation, inadequate clothing, overcrowding. In any event scarlet fever and diphtheria rates rose very markedly during the winter of 1941-42. Tuberculosis increased by 22% during that year.

What about deaths from starvation? That, after all, is the real measure of how serious a diet is? How many people died of starvation? A total of 6 people were reported to have died of starvation in this region during that year. All of them were social problems. All cared for alcohol or tobacco or other commodities than for food and they traded off ration coupons to obtain more of the particularly prized materials.

What of famine oedema? It is a condition consisting of swelling of the dependent parts of the body—the feet and the buttocks of the individual, due to a lack of protein in the blood plasma, a lack of protein brought on by the inadequate diet. Famine Oedema has been shown in this investigation as in previous investigations to precede death from starvation by a period of three to four months, following some radical change in the intake, so the incidence of famine oedema is a good way to measure the degree of inadequate diet.

There were 144 cases of famine oedema reported in the entire city of Brussels during the black winter of 1941-42. This probably does not represent the total number of cases but it certainly represents a very large percentage.

I think then one can summarize the condition of the people in the Brussels region by saying that during the black winter they were cold, they were hungry, they were tired, they lost weight, almost every one of them. They had a greater tendency toward developing infectious diseases but the danger of you or I or average individuals getting into serious nutritional difficulties as a result of the inadequate rations was very small indeed.

I have made a statement you may find difficult to follow. I have stated that the ration was reduced to basal level in November of 1941, but the winter of 1941-42 was the most difficult period these people had to face. Why, if the ration remained at this low level throughout the remainder of the German occupation, did the condition of the people not continue to deteriorate, to reach lowest ebb at the time of the Allied liberation of the country?

That can be summed up in two words: black market and because the black market played such an important part in the feeding of people of Western Europe I would like to say a word about it.

The black market sprang into being in order to satisfy two requirements. First, to increase the intake of food, and secondly, to increase the amount of money which the individuals had to buy food. The reason for that is this.

When the Germans moved into Belgium they were paid very high salaries in Belgian funds. There was no reason why not. The Nazis controlled the printing presses and payed their men exceedingly high wages compared to the ordinary Belgian standard. When all the extra money reached the market it was inevitable that prices would spiral upwards very rapidly and of course among the scarcities was food and the price of food rose very rapidly indeed. To such a degree did this inflation extend that late in the winter of 1942 it became almost impossible to buy the 1200 legally available calories.

Had I been a high school teacher, let us say, living on the salary an average high school teacher would receive in this country, and had I four mouths to feed in this family, I would have been able to purchase the legally available food for my family only for a period of four days with the salary which I made in a month, so you see here was a completely impossible situation.

There was food in the country, not large quantities to be sure, but at least enough to keep people out of serious nutritional difficulties but they were unable to purchase it in many cases simply because they did not have the funds, so in response to this requirement the black market sprang into being. It became exceedingly expensive, so expensive that it involved every living individual above infancy and early childhood.

There were three different ways in which people became involved in the black market. A relatively small number became involved as one would say as wholesalers. They obtained by hook and crook, truck or other vehicles and went into the country and paid large prices and came back and sold to the retailers for many times what they had paid for it. A few were involved in this way. A great many were involved in the ensuing two ways. Many were involved as retailers. Not by any means all of the black market food in Brussels was sold through recognized retail channels. A great deal was sold through ordinary households. People would buy a little food for a large price and sell at a great deal higher price to friends and neighbours along the street. But the way in which you and I would have been involved in the black market had we lived in Brussels at that time was this. We would have done our week's work and then on our day off, we would have taken a bicycle—that was the only method of transport left—we would have taken some jewelry that had been in the family for some time or taken money and cycled out into the country and perhaps have bought what corresponds to 25 pounds of butter in this country and we would have paid a large price for the 25 pounds of butter. Then we would have gone back into Brussels, we would have kept 15 pounds of the butter and we would have sold the remaining 10 pounds for four or five or ten times what we paid for the whole purchase. In that way we not only increased our larder but also increased our income so we would be able to purchase illegally available food.

The black market assumed such proportions that beginning in the Spring of 1942, it had supplied to every man, woman and child in the Brussels area an average of approximately 1000 calories a day. It brought the consumption up from the 1200 calory level where they were in very serious nutritional difficulties, where they had deteriorated during the winter of 1941-42, up to the relatively safe level of 2200 to 2300 calories on which they steadily improved throughout the remainder of the German occupation. That was the reason why it was so difficult to find gross evidences of malnutrition in the cities and other urban centres in Western Europe at the time of the liberation.

That is the first type of malnutrition which occurred in Western Europe and I don't want anyone to think I was trying to minimize the discomforts that the people went through. Their hunger was very real, their loss of weight was very real. They spent a most uncomfortable time.

The second kind of malnutrition I would like to discuss occurred in Western Holland and I would like to say a few words about the food supply of Holland and the population of this country. As you know, it is an exceedingly small country. It represents a very tiny part of the size of the Province of Ontario. Its total population is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 7 to 7½ million people. Its people are not distributed evenly over the country available to them. The agricultural areas in the north, the northeast and the east, and the mixed manufacturing and agricultural areas in the south are relatively sparsely populated and the great bulk of the population are located together in the western part of the country in that area around the large cities, The Hague, Rotterdam, and Amsterdam.

They have singularly poor agricultural land. Nearly all is reclaimed land, useful for crops for forage, but completely inadequate for market gardening. The great bulk of the Netherlands under ordinary circumstances obtained food from two sources. A fair amount was imported from other countries, some from as far away as Canada. Secondly, they obtained the food grown in the agricultural areas of the old country by a rather involved system of transport. First of all their excellent railway system which transported the more perishable foods from the agricultural areas to the area where it was required, Secondly, and far more important, their canal system and their barges on which they moved the great bulk of the food from the areas in the northeastern part of the country. I think the people of western Holland probably tightened their belts a little more rapidly and severely than did the other people of Western Europe, at the time of the German occupation, because immediately the Germans came in, their imports from outside were cut off. Nevertheless they managed to put in four relatively comfortable years, a little worse off than people in the Brussels area. The people certainly lost weight but the black market flourished and they were able to get by without any serious evidence of malnutrition.

Then suddenly in the Fall of 1944 the situation deteriorated very rapidly indeed because of two factors. The first was a change in the attitude of the occupying Germans. Apparently the Germans when they realized that the Allies had conquered most of France and most of

Belgium decided they could not possibly hold on to the remaining parts of Western Europe which they then held, and that their best chance was to withdraw to the borders of their own country, taking with them all the materials which might conceivably assist them in withstanding siege within their own land. So they took with them from Holland everything that might possibly assist in this regard. They took food, manufacturing machinery, but the most important thing of all from the point of view of the Dutch, was their barges. The canal system had been taking quite a beating from the Germans and they took as many of the Dutch barges back as they could lay their hands on.

As a result, fairly quickly, in the Fall of 1944, the barge traffic in the Dutch canals fell off very markedly indeed and the main manner of transporting food from agricultural areas to the large urban centres was removed.

Then, very suddenly and very dramatically the second blow hit Holland. You all remember the ill-fated airborne attempted invasion at Arnheim. I think September 12, 1944 on the day the invasion attempt occurred the B.B.C. broadcast to the Dutch people asking them to sabotage their railways so the Germans would not have the benefit of their railway system in defending Holland. And to such good measure did the Dutch accede to this request that within a period of 12 hours the Dutch railways ceased functioning. The people went underground, and the railways stopped immediately. The Germans attempted to take them over during the ensuing weeks, but the sabotage continued and in the face of many incidents and much loss of life, the Germans gave up.

But if they were not going to use them they were going to see that the Dutch were not going to use them for some time so the railways were relieved of their electrification devices and they stripped the roads of every moveable part. So you have the large population group in the west of Holland suddenly without any means of obtaining the food supply on which they relied which was grown in the northeast part of the country.

As a result of these two facts, there was a sudden precipitation from the legal ration available from somewhere in the negihborhood of 1100 calories down to about 500 or 600 calories. No nation can be maintained on a ration containing only 500 or 600 calories. Sheer starvation stares them in the face in a very short space of time.

The Dutch Government and the people themselves took every possible steps to increase the intake of food. Some of the methods are worth mentioning. In the first place practically every Dutch family with true canniness had tucked away in their cellar or dug deep in their garden a store of emergency food for just such a time as this. Some fell back on private stocks of food.

Secondly, they made tremendous use of fundamental teaching and brought in the best medical and dietetic people in the country in an attempt to augment their meagre stores of food with others not usually eaten but edible products which added calories and nutrients in the soup in the kitchen. So extensive did the use of communal kitchens become that in one large centre in western Holland during that bad winter, over 90 per cent of the people in the city had one meal at least in the communal kitchen.

Thirdly, they made extensive use of materials that would not ordinarily be used for human consumption. The main product with which we relate Holland is the bulb. The bulbs which were grown in western Holland graced the table in that winter of 1945 instead of the garden. Sugar beets were quite prominent in the western part of the country and were eaten by human beings that winter steadily instead of by animals.

And, finally, and most important of all, the people themselves tried to conduct individual searches for food and the roads of western Holland in that cold winter of 1945 were literally covered with people on bicycles trying to make the last trip up to the northeast part of the country to obtain a little bit of additional food for their families.

The people were tired. They were not fit to make long journeys. Their clothing was not adequate. No clothing had been made in Holland from the time the Germans came into the country four years before. You can imagine how ill equipped they were to withstand the cold winter. Their bicycles were very bad indeed.

Those who had retained their bicycles for the most part had no tires or they had rope wrapped around the rims and on these rickety conveyances and inadequate clothing, thousands and thousands of people made the trip on the windswept cold roads to obtain food and not by any means all of them were able to make the trip. A great many broke down on the way and emergency hospitals sprang up in churches and schools and private dwellings along the main highways to look after the people to bring them in to give additional food for a period of two to three days and send them on their way.

I should think almost every family in western Holland has one member, in many cases many members, who made one or more trips to eastern parts of the country to obtain extra food for their family for that winter. The amount of food brought back was sometimes pitifully small—sometimes five pounds of barley or ten pounds of meat.

As a result of this, encouraged by the Government and worked out by themselves, the Dutch were able to increase the intake of food up to somewhere around 1100 to 1500 calories, depending on the part of the country involved. During the months of January, February and March, this represented about the average intake of food available to the individual inhabiting western Holland.

They then suffered a further setback. Some of the measures they were taking to increase food were short-lived and couldn't continue for very long. For instance, their own personal source of foods were very rapidly used up, once they started to delve into them. The sugar beets and bulbs formed a prominent part of the diet during the first months but didn't last long when everybody started to eat them. They were soon over.

Perhaps, most important of all, the Germans put a ban on the myriads of people who had started cycling from one part of the country to another, and this precipitated a further drop in the number of calories available to the population in western Holland and it fell to somewhere in the neighborhood of 400 calories. Fortunately that didn't last long. That was only about six weeks before the Germans surrendered. Had it lasted longer, it would have been very serious indeed.

As it was, let us think for a moment which was the result of the inadequate diet on the population of western Holland. Everything I have said about the people in Brussels was certainly true to a much greater degree in western Holland. They were hungry, they were cold, they didn't receive enough food to keep comfortable, they lost weight in every age group to a much greater degree than in Brussels. The incidence of infectious disease rose alarmingly and in communities whose public health record before the war was excellent. As far as deaths from starvation were concerned, from the basis of Public Health reports, it looks as though 1200 people in western Holland lost their lives as the result.

Now, the average individual was not affected. Most of the 10,000 people belonged to three well defined groups. The first group was the very aged population. The people too old to get out and rummage around and try to obtain additional food. The second group was the very poor population. The very poor people had nothing to give, nothing with which to buy the additional food for their families. The picture (slide shown) shows a little girl who looks about ten or eleven years old but actually is 17 years of age. She does not represent in any sense what the average Dutch child at 17 years of age looks like. Actually this sort of picture was confined to those areas where very poor sections of the population were to be found. So the very poor were the second group to be involved in the most severe of the symptoms as the result of the lack of food.

The final group to be involved were the occupants of institutions. The people who lived in sanitoriums, or mental hospitals. The Germans, as you know, had no great zeal for carrying on the life of a mental person so the person living in mental institutions had the greatest difficulty in obtaining even the legal amount of food available and these people deteriorated very rapidly, to such a degree that the deaths that occurred of the 10,000 people that died of starvation in western Holland, were for the most part in that group.

How many cases of famine oedema occurred in western Holland? Well, on the basis of the examinations we did it looks as though a quarter of a million people had famine oedema at the time the Germans left the country. That figure was supported by further work the Dutch did themselves. They set up outpatient departments in various places throughout the country to treat the famine oedema cases and they found the incidence of famine oedema in the group of persons that turned up to be treated, was somewhere in the neighborhood of 23,000 so it looked as though there were in the neighborhood of 200,000 to 250,000 who were suffering from famine oedema and were within a period of three or four months from death by starvation at the conclusion of the German Occupation.

I would like to sum up what occurred in Western Holland in just a few words. The people there were singularly uncomfortable, singularly badly off. They were within a very short time, indeed, of a major catastrophe.

The next slide shows a chart which indicates that in an old peoples home in Amsterdam there were 650 occupants, and in the month of January, among the 650 occupants there were no cases of famine oedema. The incidence of famine oedema among these occupants rose rapidly until in May of 1945 there were 235 of the total number who were suffering from famine oedema. They were doomed to death in a few months unless the ration was changed.

I should like to go on and say a few words about Concentration Camps. The concentration camp I would like particularly to speak about is Belsen. As you know, Belsen is a political concentration camp, a place where the Nazis put people who did not adhere to the Nazi ideals in their own country or in Occupied countries. They were people whom the Nazis feared had sufficient influence in their own countries that they might do a good deal of harm to the Nazi cause. These people were by no means the riffraff in the country. They were brought to places like the Belsen Concentration Camp and there interned. Belsen was situated in a relatively uninhabited part of Germany. It was a large camp in terms of the amount of acreage it covered. It was barbed wire enclosed, of course, and inside the barbed wire were dozens of huts similar to the 35 man huts we used in our Services, but instead of 35 men in each hut, the Germans put anywhere between 200 and 600 people in each of these dwellings. These people were fed always in the same way—twice a day—a large tureen of watery potato soup which was pushed in through the open door at either end of the hut. Every individual was equipped with a tin mug and it was his own responsibility how much of this material he obtained before it ran out. The people able to survive long periods in the Belsen Concentration Camp were people with tremendous will to win through and tremendous physical endurance to fight their way up to the soup tureen and obtain three or four cupfulls. This was at the expense of their fellows, because after they were there a few days nobody thought of anything else or anybody else and in that way some of them retained their physical well being.

When the Army went into the Concentration Camp nobody had any idea how many had been there. The Germans asked for a 48 hour truce. They stated that they wanted to mend the fences. The typhus epidemic raging inside the camp would not extend to the surrounding territory, and also to bury the dead.

They did neither of these things but they did destroy every record available in the Camp of who the occupants were. It turned out later that there were something like 50,000 in the camp at the time the British Army entered.

For the purpose of simplicity I am going to try to divide the people into three main groups. The first group and those best off were people either in the camp for a long priod of time and who had tremendous physical endurance and who had been able to maintain their physical and mental state on the inadequate food which they had received, those people required only a little special feeding for a relatively few days or weeks and were able to go back home.

The second group, unfortunately also quite large, were a group of people who had deteriorated physically but not so far that they could not be returned on the Bengal Famine mixture which was fed to most of the occupants of the camp and was made of skimmed milk powder, flour and sugar and is a singularly easy thing for people not eating to be able to digest.

The second group were those able to take that, and keep it down, and gradually gain strength. Unfortunately, they had been so disturbed mentally by so long a period in the camp that their mental return was far from as rapid as their physical return. When we saw the people in the camp they were lower in any sense of the word than any domestic animal one could imagine. They had lost their ability to see. They had of course no idea what their names were. They had no idea where they came from. They didn't know how long they had been there. They were simply mute. They were people whose only noise was a high pitched cry. There were thousands of these people and they represented the most disturbing sight to be seen in the Belsen Concentration Camp.

It looked for a long time as if there was absolutely no hope of any return to normal of this group. However, a very short time ago Sir Drummond was over in this counry from England and he had been back to some of the places where the people were being treated a few months ago and he said that after about a year of treatment with good food and quiet surroundings, when these people had long since been returned to their prewar physical state, they began to get a glimmer of normal intelligence. As soon as the glimmer began to return very rapidly they returned oward normal and the great bulk of the people by that time had been discharged back to their own homes, knowing where they came from and knowing their families and taking up their prewar status in life again.

The third group was the group that was too far gone to take even the Bengal Famine Mixture. The group who as soon as they attempted to take any food lost it almost immediately. Most of these people died in the month following the taking over of the camp by the Allies.

May I have the next slide? This reveals one of the common graves of which you have seen many pictures in the newspapers. This represents the number of people picked up one morning who had died in one night during the month after the Allies had taken over, people for whom absolutely nothing could be done.

We have often heard the expression, "skin and bones". That expression didn't mean very much to me until one actually had an opportunity of seeing these people who had died in the Belsen Concentration Camp but it actually is true. People do deteriorate until there is nothing left but skin and bone and some of the people shown in the common grave are in that state.

Now, Gentlemen, I have talked long enough. I have tried to describe today three different degrees of malnutrition which prevail in Western Europe. The first was a relatively mild one which condition had every discomfort of loss of weight but it did not entail any severe danger of loss of life or severe illness as a result of lack of food. The second, that which occurred in Western Holland was very much more severe than the first. It entailed a great deal of discomfort and incurred at the conclusion a great danger of loss of life. I think we can say by only a few weeks was a very serious catastrophe missed in Western Holland. The third had to do with the concentration camps and that meant complete and utter tragedy for every individual who was involved. Thank you very much.

"WHAT IS CANADA'S POSITION IN THE WORLD TODAY?"

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. R. W. KEYSERLINGK

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, March 6, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air.

Until a few years ago Canada's position in the British Empire was that of a country, a colony under British Colonial Authority. Today we stand clothed in Dominion status, independent insofar as the administration of our internal affairs are concerned. Canada, along with the other dominions of the Commonwealth, stands as an equal partner in working out the destiny of the Empire. And that co-operation has grown firmer and will continue as the years go by, between all the partners in the Commonwealth of Nations which form the British Empire.

But this dominion status brings to us added responsibilities. We must keep our house in order as befits a self-governing dominion, co-relating our actions with those of the British Empire at large, but transcending all is our responsibility to mankind and to the world. In relation to the world picture, Canada's position has changed—is changing—and history will record changes still to come.

What is our position today internationally? We are about to hear of this from one who has made a study of international affairs and is eminently qualified to analyze the subject.

Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk has enjoyed a brilliant and a very unique career. Born in St. Petersburg, Russia, the son of Count Henry Keyserlingk, a Commander in the Russian Imperial Navy. Our guest speaker is a graduate of the University of B.C., spent 4 years in Japan, part of the time at the Can. Academy in Kobe, and later two years in China. For eight years he was foreign correspondent for the Br. United Press—an accomplished linguist, author and journalist. Mr. Keyserlingk has recently returned to Canada after making an extensive tour of the Allied occupation zones of Europe.

It is my pleasure to introduce—

MR. R. W. KEYSERLINGK
Gen. Manager of the Br. United Press

who will tell us

"WHAT IS CANADA'S POSITION IN THE WORLD TODAY"?

Mr. Keyserlingk.

Mr. R. W. Keyserlingk: Canada finds herself today in the position of having to adjust her government machinery to the requirements of applied sovereign nationhood simultaneously with the necessity of assuming the unprecedented responsibilities of a nation facing a world in upheaval.

Whether we look East over the Atlantic or West across the Pacific, not to mention North across the Arctic, gigantic forces are at work reshaping, re-aligning and revising the very foundations of international society. Seldom has history witnessed such a rapid transition from the comparative calm and protected security which Canada enjoyed through the years of growth into nationhood, to the turbulence and uncertainties of the moment in which Canada has assumed her full responsibilities.

Let us just examine for a moment the world in which we find ourselves, in order to realize what the problems of a peace, of Canada's peace, actually mean.

The immediate question before the powers is the German peace settlement. We shall return to this particular phase of the problem later, since it is only a very partial aspect of the global picture.

It is not generally recognized as yet that Canada, with the United States, really forms an oasis not only of singularly happy opportunities but also of almost unique privilege of freedom and material prosperity for the individual.

Our political freedoms, our social institutions, our liberties of conscience and our respect for the individual are unfortunately today not the rule but the exception.

Last summer I visited Europe—that ravaged continent from which the very basis of a society as we understand it has been removed. It is true that the United Kingdom belongs to our world of thought, of custom and of ideology. But it certainly no longer belongs to our world of those privileges which we can still enjoy. It does not share the chaos of the Continent of Europe but it lives in the shadow of the fears which dominate that continent—fears engendered by the poverty, by the destitution and by the political disruption which have engulfed two hundred million Europeans on whom Great Britain has for centuries depended for so much of that which made and maintained her own way of life.

You cannot live within cannon shot of a continent over whose desolate stretches race the four horsemen of the apocalypse without hearing the beat of the hoofs of their galloping steeds.

Let us first scan the Western horizon. There on the vast continent of Asia forces have been unleashed which are far more fundamental and far more elemental than the surface disturbances created by the gradual or more rapid weakening of the rule of Europeans over the masses of the Dutch East Indies, or the Indo-Chinese or even the announced withdrawal of British rule over India. When the plaster cast of white-man's rule over native empires or colonies in Asia is removed we can all expect that far greater upheavals will still be in store. For the festering sores of racial, religious and national animosities which plague that continent will generate tensions and, it is feared, there will be violence on an unprecedented scale until a new balance of forces, a readjustment of rivalries will have emerged to fix a new pattern of orderliness.

Africa is more slowly emerging from the old mould into which European colonisation has fitted that vast area, but both by reason of a growing native problem on the one hand and the weakening strength of the former rulers to control distant lands and foreign people, because of the situation on their domestic front, Africa is beginning to indicate vast readjustments.

While South America in many respects shares our good fortune and maintains many of the beliefs and convictions which both of us have inherited from our common European ancestors through our common Christianity and common historical roots, political progress has been different and forms have consequently been varied. Our brand of parliamentary democracy and our privileges of personal liberty cannot find universal support amongst all our South American neighbours. They have developed their own society and created or adapted their forms through their own historical development which has not always been parallel to ours.

I am not forgetting the fifth continent—Australia. But geographically it is too far and numerically the population is too small to sufficiently influence our isolation in the midst of a world of potential, latent or actually violent change.

When one scans these immense horizons of a turbulent world in which Canada finds herself emerging in the role of a country which not only is faced with the problem of assuming a positive role thrust upon her partly by the maturity of her nationhood but also in large measure by the inevitability of her geography and her immense natural wealth, the question may well be asked whether a peace with Germany, that comparatively insignificant area, only two thirds as large as our province of British Columbia, can rightly be described as a matter of grave importance to us.

Yet the Moscow meeting of the foreign ministers of the four great powers which commences next week to discuss a German peace treaty has been described by many thoughtful observers as crucial. There are enough Germans left in the heart of Europe that their state can decide the fate of Europe. Equally, France can by a sudden change alter the political picture. Both are pivoted and either can nullify any plan of rehabilitation for the other.

To get a clear picture of the significance of this peace two things have to be emphasized. Firstly Europe still is the home of 200,000,000 people who by their ability, their intellectual level and their political experience can exert an influence which is profound in the shaping of our thoughts and our scale of values. Secondly, they are, even in their disorganization and in their destitution still a factor which can swing the balance in a world where two rival and opposed ideologies are competing for positions and are struggling for survival.

If our problems today were merely economic or political, and if the rivalries between two great, young and developing national entities, namely the United States and Soviet Russia, were merely questions of bargaining for relative advantages in delineating spheres of influences within which each could leave the other one alone —one could say that the problem is relatively simple.

But, among the strong impressions I carried away from Europe as it is today was the clear recognition that the struggle is not for an equitable distribution of accepted values but rather for a re-definition of what are values.

I witnessed elections in Europe. I was in France during one campaign, I followed the posters and electioneering speeches in Italy, I travelled through the British and American zone of occupied Germany. In contrast I also visited the Scandinavian countries.

Outwardly the methods were the same as here. Party programmes, electioneering speeches, slogans and appeals fitted into a standard pattern. But underneath it all an entirely new phenomenon could be discerned.

"Vote communist to safeguard private property" was plastered on the walls of Paris on great signs. "Nationalisation of industry" was the placard of some anti-communist parties, just to mention two paradoxes to our accustomed way of thinking. "Let the Frenchman have private property since he insists on it" explained a communist journalist whom I had asked to clarify this sudden change of accustomed party line, "for, he said, when we are in power we will tell him what to do with his property and that is all that matters. We have not changed but we have found a more acceptable formula."

"What are political slogans today" Premier de Gasperi of Italy told me in his office at the Palazzo Chigi when I asked him to clarify for me the apparent contradictions which I was noticing in what we understand as left and right in politics on this continent and what I was witnessing in Europe. "When you have lost everything and you are merely wondering how your people can be kept alive for a week or ten days through imports of food you no longer have the luxury of several choices —as you in the New World have" he said.

"Under the stress of necessities, of desperate needs, my rival Palmiro Togliatti the Communist leader and myself cannot differ in action because there is only one way open to us if there is any. Necessity dictates to us. We do not choose. Our fight is not about the how of government or politics but about the why of existence".

Whether asking the question of de Gasperi or talking to political leaders in France or even in occupied Germany there seemed to come the same explanation. Orderly politics as we understand them presuppose the existence of a common denominator of the good for society. A common acceptance of the value of what is good and what is bad has first to be established and then political parties can divide on the method, on the means how to bring about that universally desired goal of a better life for society. But when that common denominator disappears and what seems à desirable goal for one becomes a living hell for the other, when there are no more common values which bind all parties into what we so well describe as His Majesty's Government and His Majesty's Most Loyal Opposition, serving the same majesty whether the monarch or the sovereign people to achieve the same kind of a good life. When this no longer exists then orderly political democracy ceases to function.

"The question is not in the how of politics" de Gasperi said. "The question is the WHY. Why do I want to keep Italians alive and why does Togliatti, the Communist, want live Italians. The how of keeping them alive offers neither of us a choice. Most decisions don't even depend on Italy but on foreign outside aid, on treaties decided upon outside by other powers to which both of us would have to submit. No, why do we want people to live, not how, is the question which today divides all political parties in Europe. I want Italians to live in the hope that they can again be ranged into society as free individuals enjoying the liberties of a Western Christian society where their personal liberties are sanctioned by the dignity of a divinely created individual. Togliatti wants to range them in as functional units in a materialist concept of a collective totalitarianism. That is the real issue—not such accidents of procedure which we used to call political programmes".

And here we come to the crux of today's peace problem in which Canada has such a vital interest, an interest which has been forcibly expressed by the Canadian Government.

As the Hon. Paul Martin, Minister of National Health and Welfare, stated last Saturday at a dinner of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs in Sherbrooke, Que., "In its presentation of preliminary views on the German settlement, the Canadian Government has emphasized that the German problem must be dealt with not from the point of view of solving immediate issues on the basis of expediency, but in a manner best calculated to benefit Europe as a whole".

No thoughtful observer can fail to see that two rival concepts are fighting in Europe of what will "best benefit Europe as a whole". Europe is either to be ranged into the orbit of Western society of which we in Canada are a part, or else Europe is to be ranged, as large portions of Europe have already been ranged, into an Eastern society from which the West is excluded today not only in the realm of free access to trade but exchange of thought, of travel and of information. The question resolves itself very largely to where the so called Iron Curtain will be drawn which would reduce our kind of world in size and our individual commercial or intellectual activities in scope.

Why, many people ask, cannot the difference between the two systems and the two ideologies be taken for granted and cooperation still exist?

That is a question which cannot be answered from one side only. I tuned in to the Soviet controlled radio while in Frankfort one night last May and if I had not been aware of the passage of time, of the fact that Dr. Goebbel's charred remains had been found in the Reichschancellory and that Hitler's regime had collapsed, the programme would not have made me aware of that fact. I heard a very fulsome programme being broadcast to the German people about the attributes of the 'effete Western powers' and the iniquities of the Western plutocracies.

Assuming that we have a very strong conviction in the rightness of our values, in the truth of our religious and moral tenets then it would follow that there where we can exert control we would like these fundamental beliefs to be safeguarded and their practice assured. We would also feel that it is our sacred duty to extend this privilege to others.

Assuming also that very strong convictions are held in the rightness of their values, in the truth of their tenets by those who envisage a different kind of society and we are faced with the age old problem of cleavage on fundamental issues. If we then go one step further and examine the differences between "dialectic materialism" on the one hand and Christian Truth on the other, we see that the two are incapable of reconciliation. Unless therefore one side or the other is willing to give up its fundamental beliefs a conflict in the realm of the spirit, in the realm of ideology and therefore in the realm of applied social and political practice is unavoidable. Each side, each point of view, will endeavour to extend its ideas over those areas and over the minds of those people who form the still fluid social and political vacuum. A condominium over minds by two fundamentally opposed convictions becomes an absurdity.

Expediency might dictate temporizing. Wisdom and prudence might suggest sidestepping thorny issues, but sooner or later the clash of ideas breaks forth—assuming always that both sides maintain their convictions.

But clashes in the realm of ideas need not lead to violence. The danger in the situation comes rather when the plane of ideological combat is abandoned and material, physical disputes replace the clashes of ideas.

Here we must ask ourselves which side will be more inclined to rely on physical efforts to safeguard its beliefs—the side which acknowledges spiritual values or the side which denies them.

The novelty in today's situation lies in the fact that never before in the recorded history of mankind has such an overwhelming military defeat of such great numbers of people ever been followed by such fundamental cleavages in the concepts of the kind of a world which is considered desirable.

We are not seeing today a world divided between two differing kinds of social valuations but we are faced by two divergent forces separated by the vast masses of Europe who present in many respects a social and political vacuum. The physical destruction, the economic disintegration and the moral dejection not only of the Germans but of many millions in other countries has been on such an unprecedented scale that of themselves these people are not going to reconstitute themselves. They tend even today to attach themselves to one or the other concept of society, they look to either one side or the other for leadership. If that vacuum can be filled with that fine balance which will maintain a power equilibrium, then time and inevitable change can do much to lessen the tension. If the already precarious position of the Western influence is further narrowed then the balance is destroyed and the inevitable consequences of such disequilibriation must lead to a further advance of the strengthened forces.

We must not forget that when we talk of Germany—it no longer exists as a national entity. There are today some 70,000,000 Germans, a fluid mass of individuals whose formation will be moulded by one side or the other—not by both. When one watches the diplomatic manoeuvers of the peace treaty it is obvious that it is not primarily the future of Germany that interests us but how Germany can be fitted into a general picture which will not give the other side an overwhelming advantage. We want to reconstitute Germany so it will not again become a danger to us—a danger which it can only become if Germany can become part of a hostile constellation.

When we talk today of national animosities in Europe we are overlooking an important new factor which exists there. Historical national' boundaries are not always the real lines of demarcation. Ideological demarcations are often far stronger divisions. The French communist feels no animosity towards the German Communist or the Austrian or the Spanish communist and in fact feels much closer to any of them than he values his fellow Frenchman of opposing political views. The same goes for the Italian or the Czechoslovak or Belgian. It also goes for people of opposite political or ideological conviction.

Yes, we are an oasis in a world where forces are abroad which bear little resemblance to our thinking and to our estimate of values. We are a singularly fortunate people with much to be thankful for and much to lose compared to the destitution and poverty which is the lot of so many millions. But with it also we are faced with the immense responsibility which this privileged position bestows. Together with the United States we stand almost alone today in a world where the clamour for material aid and political guidance, for the maintenance of the ideal of liberty which we hold can only be upheld in the safety of distance and the saftey of proximity to a friendly neighbour—a privilege those countries on the periphery of two rival concepts no longer have.

Because we possess much, because our children still have a priceless heritage of vast and virgin resources, because they have the privilege of starting their lives with the advantage of bodies nourished with ample food and free minds which can benefit from unhampered education and can be taught to worship by men whose faith is not challenged by persecution, we have most to lose. To Canada has fallen in her young years a major share of the responsibility of holding aloft the torch of freedom and of liberty so it may burn brightly for our sons and daughters and their children, the torch which the older and now weakened hand of Europe no longer can hold. Not only for ourselves but for all, this torch must be held aloft. Alone we cannot survive. To save our values we, the few fortunates amongst the people of the world, must act for a peace where the tranquility of order is assured by our actions. Europe is indeed Canada's peace problem.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE RT. HON. FRANCIS MICHAEL FORDE, P.C.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, March 13, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: On January 13th we heard over the radio from Vancouver that the newly appointed High Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Australia to Canada had just arrived and we, therefore, immediately wired an invitation to him to be the guest of honour of the Empire Club on his first visit to Toronto which, in due course, he graciously accepted.

Our speaker was born and educated in Australia and after teaching school for a short time, qualified as an electrical engineer in the Postmaster-General's Department. In 1917 he won his first seat as Labour Representative to the State Parliament of Queensland and had the distinction of being the youngest member of Parliament. In 1922 he was nominated as Labour candidate for the federal electorate of Capricornia, holding this seat until 1943.

Our speaker has served on many committees and Royal Commissions and is a fully qualified and able administrator. In 1941 he became Deputy Prime Minister and, as Minister for the Army, was given the vital job of expanding Australia's military forces, taking office only two months before the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbour by the Japanese. Australia then faced with the greatest crisis in her history had to build up and equip an army in the shortest possible time, and it became his task to plan and supervise this tremendous undertaking.

Our speaker visited Australian and American troops in the front line in New Guinea, Borneo and the Solomon Islands and later was chosen leader of the Australian delegation to the United Nations Security Conference at San Francisco in 1945.

The Empire Club of Canada welcomes today the Rt. Hon. Francis Michael Forde, P.C., High Commissioner for the Commonwealth of Australia to Canada, who will address us on the subject

"AUSTRALIA'S PLACE IN THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH"

RT. HON. FRANCIS M. FORDE: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I thank you for your kindness in inviting me to lunch with you today, and for giving me the opportunity to talk to you on the subject of Australia's place in the British Commonwealth. I shall speak briefly of our growth and development as a partner in that Commonwealth and deal with our present constitutional position and our relations with the other parts of the Empire.

I suppose that the basic factor of our relationship with the British Commonwealth is that we are 98% of British stock.

Our name came from the Spaniards. It was the Spanish navigator De Quiros, who discovered the New Hebrides and, thinking that he had found the great southern continent, gave us the name Tierra Austrialia del Espiritu Santo, "The Southern Land of the Holy Ghost". Long afterwards the name "Australia" was given to our country. It was however, the Dutch who first discovered the Australian continent in 1642 when, Van Diemen, the Governor of the Netherlands East Indies, organized a great expedition to the southern land which was led by Jan Abel Tasman. On the afternoon of 24th November, 1642, Tasman, according to his diary, saw land some ten miles away. His diary reads:

> "This land being the first land we have met with in the south sea and not known to any European nation, we have conferred on it the name of Anthoony Van Diemens Land in honour of the Honourable Governor-General, our illustrious master, who sent us to make the discovery".

Tasman landed near Hobart, the capital of Tasmania, our island state on 2nd December, 1642. Three weeks later he discovered New Zealand and before long he sailed along the northern coast of Australia.

In the 18th century the French arrived. Most of the French expeditions were of a scientific nature and our traditional friendly relations with the French have been maintained ever since. Indeed, one French scientific expedition arrived while the Napoleonic War was at its height but the Governor of New South Wales, acting under Admiralty instructions, warmly welcomed the French, an act which the Leader of the expedition, Baudin, did not fail to appreciate.

However, despite the Spanish, the Dutch and the French, we are as I said earlier, almost entirely of British stock. We have some minorities, the largest consisting of Italians who, prior to the war, constituted a majority of the people in a sugar producing district in North Queensland, and the Germans, who are mainly descendants of German Liberals, who came to Australia after the 1848 revolution and have done much to build up the wine industry in south Australia. We have also a fair number of Chinese who originally came to Australia during the gold rush days. Many refugees from central Europe came to Australia from 1935 onwards, although alien immigration was stopped during the war years.

I come now to a brief account of our constitutional history. As you know, Australia consists of six States (or Provinces as you call them). These States, prior to Federation (which occurred in 1901) were already in existence as independent British colonies each of which had been settled and had grown up in its own way. The first settlement was made on 26th January, 1788, when Captain Arthur Philip established the colony of New South Wales at Sydney, our largest and oldest city. The colony of New South Wales was roughly defined and covered the whole of the eastern part of the continent.

In 1828 the island of Van Diemens Land was separated from New South Wales and this Island, the name of which was changed in 1853 to that of Tasmania, has remained separated ever since. Melbourne, the capital of Victoria, had been founded about 1836 but the State of Victoria was not formally separated from that of New South Wales until some time later. A further diminution in the eastern province of New South Wales was made when Queensland was separated in 1859. In the meantime Western Australia and Southern Australia had been established in 1829 and 1836. Thus by 1900 there were six separate colonies in existence.

Self Government was obtained during the fifties. Prior to this, in 1823 and 1828, Imperial Statutes had set up a nominee Legislative Council to assist the Governor in the administration of New South Wales, while a Council of 7 comprising 4 nominees and 3 officials had been established in South Australia and the other colonies. The elective principle was introduced in 1842 for New South Wales. The Legislative Council was to consist of 36 members, 12 nominees and 24 elected members. The Council was empowered to increase its membership provided that it retained the proportion between nominee and elected members. An important and significant provision of this legislation was that it gave to the residents of what was to become the State of Victoria, a special position in relation to New South Wales. It was provided that at least five members were to be returned by that district to the council. This did not satisfy the local population and in 1848 the electors returned as the member for Melbourne the Colonial Secretary, Lord Grey, who could obviously never take his seat. This step brought to a head the question of Representative Government as a whole. It should be remembered that Lord Durham had in 1839 written his famous report on Canada, that the Reform Bill in England had been carried in 1832 and that the Chartist movement and the general tendencies of the times had opened the way for Self Government. So in 1850 the Australian Colonies Government was passed. It established the separate colony of Victoria and gave it a two thirds elected legislative council. Similar councils were established in Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania. What was more important was that this Act empowered these Colonies to alter their own constitutions. This was an entirely new departure for it represented a surrender by the Imperial Parliament of its complete powers in regard to the colonial constitution. This provision for amendment was still not possessed by New South Wales, but, following protests by the Legislative Council there, it was empowered to draft a new constitution. As far as possible, the Committee appointed in 1852 modelled the new draft of the British system establishing two Houses, a nominee Legislative Council holding office for life and an Assembly to be elected by persons with a certain property qualification. The new Constitution for New South Wales was finally enacted in 1855. This constitution introduced the principle of responsible Government that is, the system under which the Cabinet is required to possess the confidence of Parliament. A similar plan was established, subsequently, by the other Colonies. Another important provision of the Australian Colonies Government Act was that it enabled the colonies to impose customs duties on imported goods whatever their origin. Their powers were thus virtually unlimited.

The colonies soon began to exercise their powers in regard to alteration of the constitution. It should be remembered that the gold rush had brought in many liberal-minded men from Britain, as well as a mixed European population who immigrated to Australia after the revolutions of 1848. The opportunities for securing action along liberal lines soon led to such things as voting by ballot, payment of members of Parliament, universal suffrage and abolition of property qualifications. Indeed, voting by ballot was adopted by the Australian colonies before it was applied anywhere else within the British Empire. It did not gain acceptance in England until 1872. The franchise was conferred on women by South Australia in 1894. The two Colonies which had had nominee upper houses, namely New South Wales and Queensland retained that system until 1922 in Queensland, when the second chamber was completely abolished and 1934 in New South Wales when a new system was introduced, the members of the Council being elected by the Council and the Assembly jointly and holding office for 12 years.

I come now to Federation. Australia's position in the Pacific was primarily responsible for this step. You have all heard of New Guinea which is less than 100 miles from our northern shores and the largest island in the world after Australia itself. New Guinea would be roughly about the size of the Canadian Province of British Columbia. The western end of the island had been occupied by the Dutch for a considerable time prior to 1870 when the colonies of New South Wales and Queensland had urged the annexation of the eastern portion. The home authorities refused to take any action and the Premier of Queensland, who foresaw German annexation sent a magistrate to annex the eastern portion in the name of the Queen. The United Kingdom Government was indignant and repudiated the annexation declaring that they were convinced that Germany had no designs on New Guinea. No less than a year later however, a German ship proceeded to New Guinea and its captain annexed the island together with the adjoining islands of New Britain and New Ireland. The Australians were extremely angry but the episode had two good affects. In the first place, it did much to crystallize their decision to become a united nation speaking with a united voice. In the second place, they were awakened to their interest in foreign affairs. Moreover, the New Guinea episode had its effect in Whitehall. The home authorities saw that, in the words of Lord Rosebery who visited Australia shortly after the incident,—

> "the connection of loyalty between Australia and the mother country—would survive—as long as the home country and the daughter country are allowed to preserve their position of mutual independence and mutual self-respect".

The United Kingdom did much to help the cause of federation which was achieved in 1901.

A few words about our Federal system. While basically similar in its retention of British institutions, the Australian system differs in some respects from that which was adopted in Canada. The framers of the Australian constitution had before them both the Canadian model and the American model. In the allocation of powers between the central Government and Provincial (or State Governments as we call them) they followed the American system, under which there is only one list of powers namely those which may be exercised by the Federal Parliament and Government. Everything else remains with the States. This is the chief difference between our systems. There are others, such as the rather more complete independence of the State Governments who still appoint their own respective governors and judges, and the differences in the composition of our Federal Parliament. This consists of two Houses, the House of Representatives, which corresponds to your House of Commons, and the Senate. In regard to our Senate, we again followed the American precedent in setting it up as a "States" House. Its members are elected by the people on a basis of universal suffrage for a term of six years, half of them retiring every three. It is provided in our Federal constitution that each State, regardless of its size, shall return the same number of Senators which, at the moment, is six, making a total of 36. The people in each State vote for the purpose of electing Senators as one electorate. Our Senate thus differs from yours in a very fundamental respect. Our House of Representatives consists of as nearly as possible twice the number of Senators and at the moment numbers 75 members. We have thus not nearly as many members in our Federal Parliament as you have, but recently there has been some suggestion of an increase.

The Commonwealth of Australia, having been established as late as 1900 had, of course, always been self governing and has incorporated the principle of responsible Government but as I have already said, the battle for these principles had long since been fought and won.

One thing however, was lacking as early as 1900. At this stage in the history of the British Commonwealth the principle of Dominion Status had not been established and it is in the field of foreign relations that this principle finds its highest expression. It was originally Canada which led the way but I shall not weary you with the details of the evolution of our present status. It is enough to say that the British Dominions, by the part which they played in the Great War earned for themselves a place in the Councils of the world. In 1926 came the Balfour declaration setting out that the United Kingdom and the Dominions were co-equal partners in the British Commonwealth and later in 1931 the Statute of Westminster which gave effect to the complete autonomy of the Dominions in respect of their external as well as their internal affairs. Since that time the place of the Dominions in international affairs has become accepted and the exchange of diplomatic representatives with other countries is a recognized practice.

Australia had no very definite line in foreign affairs during the twenties when the accent was on trade notably in the countries bordering the Pacific. From 1929 onwards we appointed a series of Trade Commissioners starting with Canada and including the United States, China, Japan and the Netherlands East Indies. Canada had already appointed a Trade Commissioner to Australia in 1907, the first appointment in your Trade Commissioner service, a service which I understand Canada pioneered.

With the thirties came the development of Australia's Department of External Affairs. Canada had already had a good start.

An Australian Department of External Affairs had been established in 1901 but its scope was very limited, covering such subjects as the Government of Papua, Pacific Islands mail services and research in tropical diseases. During the Great War the Department became merged in the Prime Minister's Department but after the war a special Branch of that Department, called the Pacific Branch, was constituted and after the 1923 Imperial Conference, Mr. Allan Leeper, an Australian-born member of the United Kingdom foreign service was loaned to the Australian Government for six months. He recommended the establishment of an Australian External Affairs office in London. That office continues today although we have had a High Commissioner in London since 1912.

In 1934 a Department of External Affairs was reconstituted at Canberra and the portfolio was separated from that of the Prime Minister. The first Australian foreign mission was sent abroad very shortly afterwards the Minister, Sir John Latham, visiting Japan, China and other countries of eastern Asia.

At the Imperial Conference in London in 1937 the Lyons Government proposed the constitution of a Pacific Pact, but this received no encouragement.

At the beginning of 1939, Australia's only permanent political representation abroad consisted of the High Commissioner in London, the External Affairs Officer in London and an Australian Counsellor attached to the British Embassy in Washington. Shortly before the outbreak of war, Mr. Menzies, on assuming the Premiership of the country, broadcast that,

> "Australia must regard herself as a principal in providing herself with her own information and maintaining her own diplomatic contacts with foreign powers".

The following day plans for Australian Legations in Washington and Tokyo were announced but before these posts were opened up the High Commission in Canada had been established. Not long afterwards exchanges of diplomatic representatives were made with China, the Soviet Union and the Netherlands. Later still came New Zealand, India, Ireland and South Africa, so that now we have High Commissioners in the United Kingdom and all of the Dominions. We have also exchanged diplomatic representatives with France, Brazil and Chile. We have a Commissioner in Malaya and political representatives in the Netherlands East Indies and Germany. We have also our Trade Commissioner Service which has expanded and we have recently established a Consular Service.

I will not recapitulate the vital role played by Australia in the Pacific. The establishment of the Pacific War Council in Washington was largely the result of a request by Australia and New Zealand. We had a seat on the Far Eastern Commission which met in Washington and the British Commonwealth is represented on the Allied Control Council in Tokyo. This last mentioned development is significant, marking as it does the highest point in British Commonwealth relations for it is a manifestation of a position where one of the Dominions is representing not only other Dominions but also the United Kingdom.

I come now to our relations with the United Kingdom during the war and in particular would refer to the New Year broadcast at the end of 1941 immediately after Pearl Harbour, by the late Prime Minister, Mr. John Curtin, whose words have often been quoted out of their context. Mr. Curtin, after pointing out that the Australian Government regarded the Pacific struggle as primarily one in which the United States and Australia must have the fullest say went on—

> "Without any inhibitions of any kind, I make it quite clear that Australia looks to America, free of any pangs as to our traditional links or kinship with the United Kingdom".
>
> "We know the problems that the United Kingdom faces. We know the constant threat of invasion. We know the dangers of dispersal of strength, but we know, too, that Australia can go and Britain can still hold on. We are, therefore, determined that Australia shall not go, and we shall exert all our energies towards the shaping of a plan, with the United States as its keystone, which will give to our country some confidence of being able to hold out until the tide of battle swings against the enemy."

> "Summed up, Australian external policy will be shaped towards obtaining Russian aid, and working out, with the United States as the major factor, a plan of Pacific strategy along with British, Chinese and Dutch forces".

On the following day Mr. Curtin spoke again saying:

> "Our loyalty to His Majesty the King goes to the very core of our national life. It is part of our being. I do not consider Australia a segment of the British Empire. It is an organic part of the whole structure. Australia, as an integral part of the British Commonwealth faces the problem of its own defence with sheer realism. We want to preserve Australia as a part of the British Commonwealth. We intend to do so."

No one who knew Mr. Curtin, no one who for example heard his most moving speech on the abdication in 1936, could ever doubt for a moment his fervent belief in the British Commonwealth or, as he still often called it, the British Empire.

Mr. Curtins' successor, Mr. Chifley shares his views to the full. Indeed the Australian Government with the full support of the Australian people has decided to make a gift of $81,000,000.00 to Great Britain as a contribution towards her war costs in and about the Pacific.

I would like now to speak of Australia's relations with the other British countries.

As regards Canada, we sent our first trade commissioner to you as you sent your first to us. We share the same ocean, which you can cross now in thirty-six hours. Australia has always taken a deep interest in Canada as an older brother who has been out longer in the world. Australia and Canada are each a representative of the British Commonwealth in important quarters of the globe. Each is in close relation with the United States and acts to some extent as an interpreter between America and the other British countries. Above all each is a security power.

New Zealand is, of course, our closest neighbour. At one time it seemed possible that New Zealand would join with the Australian colonies in federation and there is in fact a rather wistful clause in the Commonwealth Constitution providing that New Zealand may still come in if she wishes.

Increased shipping, air and telephone services have brought the two countries very close together and the war in the Pacific brought home to them the vital nature of the link between them.

At the beginning of 1944 after a conference at Canberra, the two governments signed a treaty, the first of its kind between two British countries. The Canberra agreement provides for consultation for security and defence and for frequent meetings of ministers. On the welfare side it envisaged a Regional South Seas Commission consisting of Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom, the United States and France, an advisory commission directed to the social, economic and welfare development of the islands and their native peoples. At a recent conference in Canberra effect was given to this provision of the Agreement.

Furthermore, the treaty set up a permanent secretariat linking Canberra and Wellington, the first machinery of its kind between two British countries. This joint secretariat established in the two capitals ensures day to day collaboration, facilitates the exchange of information, hammers out views between the two governments and assists them to make their joint contribution not only to the solution of the problems of the Pacific but to all questions of foreign affairs. Over and over again the Australian and New Zealand Governments have presented joint views to Washington or London.

As Dr. Evatt recently described it:

> "This agreement is, in effect, a permanent understanding between two States which are completely autonomous and at the same time united by a common allegiance to the King and also trustees for British Commonwealth interests and British civilization in the Pacific."

The agreement is a reality: it works.

South Africa, like Australia and Canada, is a two-ocean country and she shares with Australia the Indian Ocean. There is much else that the two countries have in common. Our first trade agreement shortly after federation was with South Africa and before the first world war we had interchanges of test cricket. We have recently established a High Commissioner's office in South Africa.

I come now to Ireland. Along with Great Britain Ireland is very much a Mother country as far as Australia is concerned. Perhaps as many as twenty-five per cent of our population comes from one part or another of Ireland. In Victoria in particular the links with Ireland are very close; to take one instance, the first four Chief Justices of the State covering a span of about eighty years were all from Ireland—whether Ulster, Dublin or Cork. One of the early Attorneys-General in Victoria, Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, had the unique distinction of sittting for West Melbourne in the Victorian Assembly and West Clare in the House of Commons at one and the same time.

The Irish in Australia were deeply interested in the Home Rule movement and in the eighties John and William Redmond, then young men of twenty-four and twenty-one respectively, made long tours in Australia raising large sums of money for the cause. Incidentally they both married Australian girls.

While the younger generation of Australians of Irish descent have ceased to take a direct interest in Irish politics, nevertheless the old ties are strong and Australia must always view Ireland's general position with regard to the British Commonwealth as a matter of interest. We exchanged High Commissioners with Ireland in 1946.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that Australia is proud of her membership of the British Commonwealth and jointly believes that the British family of nations and the United States of America are the most potent factors operating today towards a just and lasting peace, based on the four freedoms, the Atlantic Charter and Enlightened Christian Civilization.

"CANADA'S PLACE IN THE PACIFIC BASIN"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. ROBERT BAIRD McCLURE, M.D., F.R.C.S.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, March 20, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: It seems appropriate that after last week's address by the High Commissioner from Australia that we should move up the Pacific and hear about Canada's place in the Pacific Basin.

I doubt if there is anyone in Canada today who could tell us more definitely about China, Burma and French Indo-China than our speaker, who has spent the greatest part of his life in those countries.

Dr. McClure was educated in Toronto and is a graduate in Medicine from our University, later studying in Edinburough where he became a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons. After further study in Sweden he proceeded to China and in 1937 he was loaned to the British Red Cross and acted as the Field Director for Central China of the Red Cross Society.

For the last five years our speaker was Medical Director of the Friends' Ambulance Unit in China and is supposed to be home for a rest but, I understand from the United Church Department of Overseas Missions, that, although he gives good advice to his patients, he does not always accept the same from others and he is now under strict orders to actually undertake less work on his so-called vacation.

We are, therefore, doubly indebted to him today for his kind acceptance of our invitation to speak to the Empire Club and I now have a great deal of pleasure in introducing to this audience and the audience of the air Dr. Robert Baird McClure, M.D., F.R.C.S., who will address us on the subject "CANADA'S PLACE IN THE PACIFIC BASIN".

DR. ROBERT BAIRD MCCLURE: In recent weeks several outstanding speakers on political matters have pointed out very clearly the position of Canada as a bridge between Europe and the Far East. I should like to further point out some of these features particularly in respect to Canada's function as a bridge in relation to China. I should also like to point out some concrete actions that I believe we, as Canadians could take. Not only are there several steps which we *can* take but there are several which I feel we *should* take if we are going to implement the things that we have talked about so much. Many other countries have, for economic and political reasons, to confine themselves more and more to talking about these advances. I believe that Canada has talked enough about these and I hope to show that we can because of our economic and political position actually implement some of these subjects.

Civil war and political upheaval are a familiar fact of the world in which we live. Since we do not believe too much in coincidences we must come to the conclusion that these things following on a long period of international war must be due to it. I certainly feel that that is so. In the case of China I believe there are three chief causes for the civil war which is now engulfing the country. (a) War nerves, operational fatigue, or whatever you like to call it is a very distinct entity to those of us who have lived the last few years in the far East. It is a lot more than a vague alibi for all kinds of political turmoil. The fact is that the very traits in character that enable a people to withstand the effects of modern war, do if these traits are carried over into the post-war period lead to great tensions and stresses within society. Such traits as firm convictions on political matters, willingness to sacrifice much for a "cause". The deep currents of feeling about all matters. The willingness to sacrifice for these "causes". These are what enable a nation under occupation or the threat of occupation to withstand that threat and to resist the enemy. If the need for this is kept up for year after year it becomes a habit of thought. The result is a serious national situation in which men become convinced that their cause is the right cause, they become adamant in their ideas, they believe intently in certain things and they are quite prepared to die for those things in which they believe. They become uncompromising and unable to see the other man's view point. Those who, during war are capable of compromise and seeing the other man's view point became collaborationists of the worst type. Carried over into the post-war world these cause civil war.

(b) Economic disorganization is a potent cause of civil war and unrest. In modern war when an enemy occupies a country he completely organizes the industries, the crafts and the agriculture of the conquered territory. He would be foolish if he did not do so. In China this tied in the whole production of farm, village and factory to the Japanese plan of "co-Presperity in East Asia". The Japanese are great organizers and they tied up this production very effectively if not very efficiently. Effectiveness is the important thing in modern war not efficiency. The result is that each producer in China was made into a cog in a great machine. He took no part in the design nor in the construction of the machine but he was compelled to be a cog.

The cotton farmer produced cotton instead of food materials. He was fed by the scheme and he produced cotton for the scheme. The cotton was taken by a military railway to the cotton mill which processed it up to the stage of cotton yarn and nothing more. The cotton mill workers and managers were reasonably well paid for what they did and food again was forthcoming for their efforts. The yarn was then handed over to another organization, sometimes in an entirely different country but always in the "co-prosperity sphere" where it was made into cloth to order for both civilian and military needs. The cloth was then allocated by a board. The merchant was not necessary and the middleman had no place in this.

The cotton mill had the needed coal delivered to his boilers at a fixed price. He knew not from whence came the coal. It was all part of the scheme. When the war terminated there was no designed "reconversion" of this complicated system. The militarily controlled railway stopped running, the hungry farmer was left with cotton when he wanted food. The mill had neither raw cotton nor coal for the power so he closed down and put his people out of work. The yarn ceased to flow to the looms and the people ceased to find textiles on the market.

Each of you can picture for himself the utter confusion that spread in this way right from Manchuria to Java. In a re-occupied country these problems are met one at a time but with the sudden collapse of an enemy they all come at once. I doubt if master minds are available in any countries to bring a quick solution to such a complicated and far reaching problem. Certainly it was impossible in the Far East for once more Malaya came under the British, Indo-China came under the French, China and Siam were on their own, Java was again brought under Dutch rule and shipping almost disappeared completely. The internal communications had been disrupted in attaining the victory and nearly all railway and highway bridges were blown up, not by the enemy but by glorious allies. The effect on the particular bridge is about the same whether it is done by a friend or an enemy. Both the retreating Japanese and the advancing Allies seemed unanimous in the desire to blow up things anyway. Economic collapse or at least a reversion to simpler economic organization was necessary.

(c) The third factor of this type was the divergence of political thought as to the plan for the future. When the Japanese war machine advanced in 1942 subject and colonial people were suddenly left to the Japanese. They found leadership among their own people who in nearly every case, while nominally collaborating with the Japanese actually controlled their own people and often headed up anti-Japanese underground activity. For years they were to witness the effectiveness of Japanese autocracy and they had the memory of conditions under their "democratic" imperialists. These all combined on the one hand to develop their own leadership and to profoundly shake their belief in "democracy" of the British, French and Dutch type. The experience of each nation was different and so each drew conclusions that were different from the others but one rather general conclusion of the Oriental was that he could do about as well without the white man ruling him as he could with that ruler. With the sudden surrender of the Japanese the whole situation was changed. Efforts were made to reconstitute authority from above and always in the name of "democracy". "Democracy" with the restrictions of war regulations put upon it is not the same as much of theoretical democracy. Even Canadians have found that out. Little wonder is it then that political unrest and turmoil followed in nearly every country. Not only did political turmoil follow but it followed almost in direct proportion to the resistance there had been against the Japanese. That fact is important to keep in mind.

This then is the background of China's civil war. As the political and economic sky grew darker the inflation gets worse and as inflation gets worse the moral deterioration grows more serious. The end result of inflation is that new social standards tend to be set up. Those who play the game of life by the old rules tend to eat less and live more poorly than those who "adapt" themselves to the new conditions".

We must not forget the invisible destruction of modern war and the deterioration that can take place during inflation. I feel that in Greece and in many other countries who have suffered their inflations we should see the same terrible deterioration. This has two important meanings for us as Canadians. First of all we must be very sympathetic with these people who have passed through these circumstances that have been avoided in our own country.

Secondly we must grouse less about those regulations in our own country that have prevented us from falling into the same difficulties. In fact we, who have been spared so much of this part of war must be more sympathetic at all times with those who were not so fortunate.

Now as to what we can do about it. There are several things I should like to bring to your minds in this connection.

1. *Commercially.* In winning the war we have cut out the products of both Germany and Japan from the Far Eastern markets. It is not a matter of commercial rivalry but of trying to meet the consumer needs of these countries that we should strive. Aside from anything that increased exports might or might not do for Canada the fact is that we have a production capacity and we must see to it that these consumer needs other than our own get met in some proportion whether by quotas or some other means. One hates to think of the opinion the post-war world would have of us were we to refuse to meet these needs until all the needs in our own land had been met. If Canadians are ever going to think in terms of world affairs now is the time to do such thinking and then convert that thinking into action.

2. *Industrially.* We are among the fortunate few who have come out of the war with our industries in better shape than we went in. This should imply an obligation on our part. What nations like China need as much as anything else is the industrial technique which we can share with them and the machines which will allow them to produce for themselves. If we can take a broad enough view of things I feel sure we can see that every way we can raise the standard of living in these countries will be to our benefit in the increased market which they will supply. An impoverished nation is no great asset in a world order characterized by international interdependence.

3. *Politically.* Our experiments in recent years should make obvious to all of us that it is not possible for one nation to offer much aid in political matters to another

nation. Great and I believe very sincere efforts have been made in this direction in recent years with very poor results indeed. The same conclusion can be arrived at by deduction also. For instance it becomes ludicrous indeed if we consider the reception that might be given to a Chinese delegation were they to come over to our country shortly before a federal election to help make things clear to the voters of Canada. Or think of the welcome awaiting a delegation from Turkey let us say if they were to come to our good neighbor to the south in the last month before a presidential election to help clear up the points for the electors! Why then should we seem so surprised that efforts of outside nations have been unsuccessful in bridging the difficulties in China. If outside and impartial political aid could be useful at all it would probably be between the native population and the ruling country as between the Annamites and the Republic of France or between Indonesians and the Government of the Netherlands or between India and Great Britain. We have not tried such political techniques for equally obvious reasons though experiments in this line might offer some contribution to international political science. The fact is then that as things are at present we, as Canadians, can offer little or no help in China's internal political dispute. The dangers of international complications as the Chinese say of "making another Spain out of China" are all too great a risk for what might be achieved. I will say this that when the time comes that some outside help does come Canada is in a position to be of great assistance because of our detached position.

4. *Culturally*. In the field of culture we have a very big contribution to make and it is this field, which up to now, we have neglected most remarkably. A great cultural vacuum has been created in the Far East generally and in China in particular by the defeat of Japan and Germany. Nature abhors this type of a vacuum as much as she does any other. Something is bound to rush in to fill the gap. We are in a unique position.

During the war we saw the gratitude and the effectiveness of cultural missions. Both Britain and United States did fine work in this respect. British effort was in scientific and educational lines chiefly while that of United States was in agriculture and industry as well. There is no misunderstanding of such gestures. In my own profession I think of the effect of the gestures if through large-scale activity we were to strengthen all Canadian hospitals in China and make them model institutions capable of giving the same standard of medical care as we enjoy in our own country. We could expand still further and give one or two hospitals of say 500 beds to military surgery to aid in the mopping up of the war-injured both military and civilian, those injured in fighting a joint war. Or we could make a roster of teachers from our own institutions both medical and in other sciences and let some of our teachers at the rate of 10 or 20 per year go out for one-year lectureships to teach in universities where Japanese and German professors were formerly used. We could send out public health men on a one or two year term to help with some of the more obvious public health problems with small budgets sufficient to give demonstrations of the solution for some of the problems in that line.

Again, in Canada, we lead in hydro-electric development. Why not send out say five of our best hydro-electric engineers to help in the surveying and designing of future power sites in China and aid in drawing up the specifications for the plants required. At least one large German firm used to keep such a committee of engineers in China. Such men should be paid by Canada as a contribution to the development of a friendly country.

Again, in Canada, we lead in agriculture. Could we not send some of our agricultural experts to aid in the solution of some of the problems of Chinese agriculture. There is one country I can think of who if they sent 100 agricultural men to China I believe would draw forth a lusty budget from other nations for counter-measures. We in Canada should think of these things first. So one could go down the list. In all this Canada would be enriched as well.

One could go on at some length, but your own minds can give you a lot of ideas far better than I can. You know what we have in Canada better than I do. You live here. What I want you to realize is that aside from the political there are so many fields in which we can help. We can give such help without any suspicion and without raising any questions. Concerted international action in time of war is taken for granted. Hundreds of millions can be spent in concerted action for the cause of destruction. Is it too much to hope that similar action on a much smaller scale might not be used in the cause of peace and in the cause of building a new world order?

Canada's position is unique. Unique in the world for we are the only nation of our size with a Pacific coast that is above suspicion in the Pacific. Not only in the Pacific but throughout the world. We are the only nation of our size in the world that is above suspicion. Even if they could do these things in many cases their efforts would be suspect in other countries. Britain would be suspected of strengthening her empire as some imperial holds are weakening. France would be suspected because of her stand in Indo-China. Holland because of her stand in Java. The nations fear Soviet imperial expansion as much as that of any other country and they seem to be clearer than some of our people in being able to distinguish between social doctrines and national ambitions. American economic imperialism is feared as much as anything. Canada on the other hand is above suspicion. We can do things that others cannot do. There is much that we can do that others are actually unable to do anyway. We can do them—the question is will we do them?

And so I do not apologize for offering these projects or suggesting this course of action. If it served in any small way from avoiding not merely war but international tensions it would be cheaper than many of the results of such tensions. That should not be our argument to-day however. This nation sacrificed money and materials but above all we sacrificed our best in flesh and blood to bring about a new world order. That sacrifice cleared the field for the new order. Even as they made the sacrifice they knew it was not bringing in the new order. It was preparing the ground that a new order might be built. If that new order is to be built it must be started soon. As we look over the map of the world to-day does it look as if we were going very much along that line to-day? I believe we are failing to do our share in this construction because of lack of imagination on our part.

So to close a talk to an Empire Club I say I am a Canadian nationalist and an imperialist. I believe that our Empire has much to give the world in lessons in political government. I believe that we have experience that is second to none. For the white members of the Empire we have shown what can be done to develop nations to their full stature and then unite them with mutual bonds across oceans. That same vision must now be applied across racial boundaries. As a nation I believe in Canada's destiny. I believe we have a job of work to do that can be done by no other nation. I believe we have a contribution that can be made by no other nation. I feel that our whole history has brought us to this place where we *can* make this contribution to the prosperity and unity of one world. In all sincerity I pray 'God grant that we *shall* make it".

"REPORT ON BRITAIN"

AN ADDRESS BY

MICHAEL BARKWAY

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, March 27th, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of The Empire Club, in January the Chairman of Your Speakers' Committee learned that Mr. Michael Barkway—Canadian representative of the British Broadcasting Corporation—was leaving for England and would return in March, so we immediately contacted him and he agreed to speak to our Club on his return.

Our guest speaker was born in England and educated at Hailebury and Queens College, Cambridge, where he was honoured with the distinguished office of President of the Cambridge Union.

Mr. Barkway has been with the B.B.C. since 1934, commencing as a sub-editor in the news department and from its inception, was placed in charge of the overseas news service of the B.B.C. We will always remember Mr. Barkway as the man who conceived and produced the famous "Radio Newsreel", which came to us nightly throughout the war.

Our guest of honour, in 1943, was United States correspondent of the B.B.C. and returned to Europe as Deputy Chief of the Radio Section of the Physiological Warfare Division at the headquarters of General Eisenhower.

Mr. Barkway also served as organizing secretary of the Commonwealth Broadcasting Conference assembled in London, which consisted of representatives from the British Dominion and India, and he also spent a year at Geneva as broadcasting expert of the League of Nations Secretariat.

As I announced last week, Mr. Barkway has told me that his story will be grim but, nevertheless, the members of the Empire Club are anxious to know just what is happening in the Mother Country, and today the Club welcomes Mr. Michael Barkway who will give us his "Report on Britain".

MR. MICHAEL BARKWAY: Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: It is, as you said, nearly two months ago since I accepted your invitation to speak to you today. That is to say it was before I went to Britain and before any of us knew of the hardships and the trials which the worst weather of a hundred years was to bring upon Britain. Knowing what we know now, I marvel that I could so light-heartedly have accepted such a terribly difficult task.

Let me be personal for a minute. I arrived in Britain early in February on the very day the fuel cuts were imposed on industrial and domestic consumers. I left just after the three-day Parliamentary debate on the economic situation. That is to say, I missed the floods and the hurricane. I was there for the worst of the cold weather and the industrial dislocation. I spent three weeks in London and another week in Manchester and in Scotland. I tell you that simply because I have no desire to emulate the flip journalists who tell you all about the condition of the country after spending three days there.

Throughout my visit to Britain, if you will let me be personal again, I wore thick woollen combinations, stretching from wrist to ankle, which I have only worn once before in my life, when stranded in a blizzard in Labrador and which I hope never to wear again. I ate more fish, which I hate, than I have ever eaten in my life before. And I was mighty lucky to eat it. I was only able to get it because I was one of the privileged people living in hotels and eating in restaurants. If I had been living at home I wouldn't have got it at all and whatever I had got would have cost my wife hours waiting in a queue. The period of my visit was the period when miners and transport workers were working on Sundays and at nights to get out the coal in circumstances of unparalleled difficulty; when the merchant seamen, for all their courage, were storm bound in east-coast ports; when most of my friends had burst pipes that they couldn't get repaired; when more than two million men and women were out of work, and thousands of others were working in unheated offices, wearing their great coats and their gloves; when transport was almost at a standstill; when aircraft were lost in trying to drop supplies to isolated villages; when sheep and lambs were dying by the million in the blizzard; when the winter sowing of grain and the vegetable crop was dying in the ground; when the people of Britain were suffering more inconvenience and more actual hardship than they had suffered since the winter of the Blitz in 1940.

So you won't expect that I should give you an address full of wit and gaiety. That relatively easy road is closed to me.

The other easy road that I can think of is to try to stir your emotions and arouse your sympathy with graphic and heart-rending tales of hardship. That road equally I refuse to take. So I am going to try and do what I imagine you would want me to do, which is to try to give you some kind of perspective and that is a terribly difficult task.

Let me say for once and I will try not to bore you by repeating it, that I can only speak as I saw and that I saw very partially. I can only claim that I shall be as objective and as frank as I know how.

First, then, some salient facts which I think are beyond controversy.

This winter is the worst Britain has had since I don't know when. People argue about the records and the figures, but I am sure it is safe to say that there haven't been two winters as bad in the last hundred and fifty years.

Secondly, let me remind you of a thing which is a little difficult to realize. Braitain has no resources of water power or of anything else. She depends for her power for industry, for domestic conumption and for everything else, on coal. I don't need to remind you of the typical heating in a British home. People still cluster round a miserable little coal fire in the grate, while a swirling draught whistles around their backs, and I was reminded quite forcibly while I was over there that a great many of them still utterly dislike what they call "central heating." But when the temperature is away below what they are accustomed to and there isn't any coal to burn in the grate it isn't very much fun.

But that is a digression. In realistic economic terms it is not important.

To come back to coal, which is basic to Britain's economy, thirdly, let me remind you that the decline in the number of miners and in the output of coal from the British mines had already set in before the war. Then followed the years of war in which British mines were ruthlessly exploited. That is the best way I can think of putting it. The coal was dug regardless. Wherever coal could be got it was taken out with the barest necessary care for replacement and maintenance. Is it then any wonder that fate should have caught up with the British coal mines?

The first comment I heard on the situation when it got really acute was the wag who said, "Be sure you're Shinwell find you out."

Then came the two serious theories. First, that the Labour Government had disgracefully neglected to provide for the eventuality of a bad winter. Secondly, that the mines had been so disgracefully neglected by their capitalist owners for many years past that this thing was inevitable anyway.

It is not for me to try to tell you which is the better explanation. But I can observe that it seems to me, it seems logically possible that both might be true.

Nor, honestly, does it seem to me very important. The immediate sharp and disastrous crisis of coal production which closed down the factories, blacked out most of the cities, was a new revelation of an old condition. The crisis was chiefly important, as I think, because it revealed for all to see the position that Britain was in. And most important of all, perhaps, it revealed to the

British people themselves. Academic calculations about a trade balance don't have very much effect on the working man anywhere in the world. Certainly on the stolid, optimistic British workman they don't make very much impact. As long as things jog gently along, as long as the housewife can make do somehow, as long as the man has a job and can get his pint of beer, even if it is watery beer, all he does is grumble. Inconveniences are a matter of grumbling. Have a good grumble and you feel better. But when it gets relatively tough, when men are thrown out of work, when there isn't any heat in the home, when you are threatened with no coal and no gas and no electricity, then you have got to do something about it.

The day I arrived in London the Government asked people not to use electricity between nine and twelve o'clock in the morning, and two and four o'clock in the afternoon. I suppose if it had been possible to switch the electricity off at the mains that would have been relatively easy. But that couldn't be done because hospitals and essential services were served by the same lines. So it was up to each user. Now, obviously, neither I nor anybody else can give you a statistical record, but I can say that I never was in any building, shop, restaurant, hotel, office, house or apartment where I found people using the electricity in the prohibited hours. I was staying in my Club, where the bedrooms are away up in the roof, reached by a difficult, devious, rather dark staircase, and one morning at ten minutes past nine when I wanted to go up to my bedroom I found that the elevator, which was self-operating, was still working. I took it. When I got out at the top, by ill luck I met a maid. I couldn't decide whether it was just my bad conscience or whether she really did scowl at me, but when a few minutes later I went to go down in the elevator I found some servant had got to the switch and turned it off. I never felt such a heel. Here I was, warmed, well-fed, asked to put up with this for a month, and for the sake of a trifling convenience of getting upstairs I was ready to disregard my public duty. That maid, ill-fed, tired, fed-up, wouldn't have dreamt of using the elevator at the time when she had been asked not to.

I say, I never found anybody wilfully ignoring that voluntary ban. I heard of a barber who made a victim hold a candle while he clipped. I saw myself in Claridge's the small Hungarian orchestra playing in a vast, dark, empty lounge by the light of a three-branched candlestick, standing on the grand piano. I met housewives who sat in their quiet unheated homes and did their housework and conducted their affairs from nine until twelve in the morning, then crouched over their electric stove for a coupe of hours before they reverted to two heatless hours in the afternoon.

But, as I say, that probably is not important in realistic economic terms. The important thing is that the crisis showed the British people what they are up against and you who remember Dunkirk and the threat of invasion and the Blitz and the second blitz and the flying bombs—and you haven't had to live with all that for six years—may well say that this in itself provides the answer. So it may. But let me remind you again that the coal shortage is only the primary and obvious shortage. Behind coal, much more significant and sinister, lies the dollar shortage. There is no point in mincing words. You know it as well as I do: Britain is living on tick. She is living on the American and Canadian loans. The *London Times* estimated just the other day that those loans would be exhausted some time next year, probably early, rather than late in the year. Analyzing the situation in a cold-blooded way, the paper discussed what Britain would have to do to prevent a very severe cut in her present living standards. There is only one answer—a great increase in production—such an increase as I confess seems to me barely possible.

I wonder if you can guess what made the people in Britain laugh most while I was over there. There is not an awful lot to laugh at in Britain now. The thing that made Britain laugh most was the new definition of an optimist as "a man who regards the future as uncertain".

I heard more genuine laughter over that crack than over anything else. You may say that there is something a little pathetic about it. I think perhaps there is. But there is astonishing courage, too.

Now, I suppose I ought to say a word about Britain's external relations. I do so reluctantly because foreign affairs are always a matter of many subtleties and complexities. They don't lend themselves to easy and sweeping generalizations.

May I illustrate that? Soon after I got back to Canada I went to a barber and I had to wait my turn. I picked up the current issue of a popular illustrated American periodical. I found that it had excellent pictures of the Royal Tour of South Africa, and under one picture of a very splendid ceremony, somewhere or other my astonished gaze fell on a caption of which I would like to quote part to you. Speaking of this splendid ceremony, the captain said:

"It was a brave show . . . and it glittered all the more brightly for the fact that it was enacted against a darkening backdrop of imperial calamity. The structure of the British Empore, raised by mighty men from Drake to Churchill, was crumbling. Even as its King paid tribute to the work of Rhodes, his royal ocusin was on his way to India to undo the work of Clive. One by one, the plums of power were slipping away—Egypt, Palestine, Burma" . . . and so on.

It is what the New Yorker would call the "Rich beautiful prose department". It was what the rest of us would call a non-too-distinguished example of an already outworn pastime known as "twisting the lion's tail". It is not worth very much attention. But doesn't it appear to you a rather curious conception of responsible journalism? that an anonymous hack journalist, using "rich, beautiful prose" as a substitute for the unaccustomed exercise of thought, should be allowed to put that kind of nonsense into several million American homes?

Definitely, foreign affairs do not lend themselves to that sort of literary exercise.

Let me, if I may, add just one word about India. I hope it may be a word of reason which may serve to re-establish some perspective.

The British Government has been committed in principle to self-government for India since the Montagu-Chelmsford Report of 1927, and I have never heard any protest about that from south of the border. All that the fuss is about now is the fixing of a date. Now, Sir, I entirely agree it is arguable whether or not it was a wise decision to fix a date. But it is arguable only in terms of a detailed discussion of continuation in India of the devious course of the negotiations which have been going on for so long. I am ready, indeed I am eager to listen to a discussion of the decision by those who are competent to discuss it in those terms. But I am not interested in a discussion of it in terms of "rich beautiful prose."

Which leads me to another observation about the much advertised decline and fall of the British Empire. Those of us who have taken any interest in Commonwealth and Empire affairs have been aware at least, I suppose for the last twenty years, that the process which reached its magnificent fruit in the Statute of Westminster, which transformed the 19th Century Empire into the 20th Century Commonwealth was a dynamic process. It hadn't reached the end at the Imperial Conference in 1926. That was the beginning, and ever since then the aim of British colonial policy has been the progressive development of self-government. Patiently and consistently that process has been going on according to the needs and the differing abilities of each territory. When the process comes near its fruition, as now in Burma, are we to lose faith in our convictions? Are we to abandon our ideals because of the jeers of people who have never understood them?

Now, Sir, I know that the Charter and customs of this club as well as the restraints of my own position, preclude me from discussing party politics, even if I were so minded, but I think within the limits of a purely objective report, one can perhaps again point some perspectives that aren't easy to discern from this distance.

May I first then quite platitudinously remind you that the battles of party warfare are fought to a considerable extent with wooden weapons. Those who take part in it and the other people on the stage understand perfectly well the significance of the manoeuvres, but the spectators in the gallery may not. You have got to be sitting in the front row to see the grease paint.

I suggest that that is worth remembering when you read accounts of British politics. Now, I may be wrong. I may have met the wrong people. I may have formed quite the wrong impression, and I certainly offer this as no judgment of my own, certainly as no deliberate statement of my own. But as a matter of factual report, I met no one during my stay in Britain who thought that a change of government was imminent or even foreseeable, and I am perfectly sure I met more Conservatives than Labour people.

Second, I wonder if you will understand me when I say there is a sense in which the complexion of the government is relatively unimportant. My emphasis is on the word "Relatively". Of course, it matters; of course, it makes a difference whether it is a Conservative or a Labour Government in Britain. A change of government would mean modification here and there. It might make things a little better, it might make things a little worse, but the fundamental situation of Britain is an absolute datum. Not even a government of angels could change it basically.

For, in its crudest terms the British dilemma is this: How are we to find enough food for rather more than forty million people to eat? The bulk of that food has to be imported, particularly this year after the disastrous weather. What has to be imported in the long run has to be paid for. Now, Britain can pay, having spent her foreign investments for the sake of her war effort, only by increased production for export, and the weather and the coal shortage between them have set back her production by an amount which no one can yet estimate. Within not much more than twelve months anyway, existing dollar credit will be exhausted; and unless British exports, particularly to the dollar countries, have expanded to an unforeseeable degree, imports will have to be cut again and that will mean food.

Let me observe, purely in parenthesis, because it doesn't need saying to this gathering, that Canada's concern in all this is obviously not entirely disinterested. Your external trade obviously is very much involved.

But still let us try to keep the perspective. The current ration in the British and American zones of Germany is, I believe, about half the British ration. Much of Europe is worse off than the United Kingdom; and if you will forgive me for saying so, I believe the British people are much more aware of their relative good forttune than most of us are of our unrivalled material prosperity. It is, therefore, presumably to be contemplated that life could be maintained in the British Islands with very much smaller imports and very much less food than at present. None of us, I think, would care to live in those conditions; but then there aren't many places in the world even at this present day, where we could enjoy the luxuries, the almost excessive food and the material welfare which Canada enjoys today.

I may be blamed by you, or by others, for putting it as bluntly as that. And I end with this: it seems to me that you cannot cross the Atlantic at the present day without being confronted, as I have never been confronted before, with the question whether this is "One World", or whether that is merely hot air. If it is one world, if it be true in sober fact that "if one member suffers all the other members suffer with it", then I think most of us have got to do a mighty lot of fresh thinking.

"THE COMMONWEALTH THAT WILL ENDURE"

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. SOLON E. LOW

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, April 3, 1947.

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and our audience of the air, many people in many lands today are asking the question "What is the future of the British Empire?" Those outside seem more puzzled about this question than those inside. The people of the British Empire take it for granted that they belong to that strange agglomeration of states which has endured for centuries and will continue ever upward as a matter of course. The British Crown for many hundreds of years has encircled the glories of the British people and ensured prosperity and peace to a sceptical and often unappreciative world.

Our distinguished guest today will address us on the subject "Can the Commonwealth endure?"

Solon Low was born at Cardston, Alberta, and was prominent in the field of education for many years before his election to the Alberta Legislature in 1935. He was appointed Provincial Treasurer in 1937 by Mr. Aberhart and became national leader of the Social Credit Party in 1944.

Mr. Low studied Social Science and Economics at the Univ. of Alberta and the Univ. of S. California. A keen student of political, social and economic problems and a staunch imperialist.

It is my pleasure to introduce the Hon. Solon Earl Low, M.P., National Leader of the Social Credit Party in Canada.

THE HON. SOLON EARL LOW: When I was invited to come to Toronto to speak to your club, I was confronted with the task of choosing a subject which would be at once an interest and a challenge to your members. I was influenced in my choice partly by the fact that you are the Empire Club, and therefore interested in and concerned about the Commonwealth; and partly by the most alarming situation in which Britain and the Commonwealth find themselves today as a result of a number of forces some of which have been hard at work over nearly twenty years.

In February, 1930, Winston Churchill, in a speech to the Navy League, said: "During the last few years a sense of powerlessness must have come across those who have taken part in the triumphant exertions which the British Empire has made in the present century. Some spring seems to have been snapped in the National consciousness. There is a readiness to cast away all that has been won by measureless sacrifices and achievements. We seem to be the only great nation which dare not speak up for itself, which has lost confidence in its mission, which is ready to resign its hard won rights."

This concern on the part of a great Briton has been shared by many others whose studies have led them to some understanding of the tragic decline in the Empire Spirit. Thousands wonder what has happened; millions looking down the years ask: "Will the Commonwealth endure?" It is because I should like to throw some light on this question that I chose to speak on *"The Commonwealth that Will Endure"*.

I make no apology for my faith in the Commonwealth, nor for my determination to do all in my power to preserve it in all its strength and splendid achievement, for to this day it has been the only successful demonstration in all the world of true international co-operation for purposes of peace as well as of defensive war. I am humbly grateful for the brilliant lesson the Empire has taught the world on how to weld together hundreds of millions of people of every color, race, and creed in existence, with only a bond of common devotion to a great ideal—freedom and justice. This matchless achievement was accomplished, as we all know, mainly through progressive decentralization and the extension of the principle of self-government as soon as the people in the component parts were ready to accept that responsibility.

I belong to a political organization that has often been called "Imperialistic" because of its ardent support of the Commonwealth and the high ideals for which it has stood over the decades. Recently, Toronto Saturday Night, in its analysis of the Richelieu-Verchers by-election results, referred to Social Credit Members of Parliament as "those Imperialists from Alberta". I was surprised to find a newspaper of the calibre of Saturday Night slavishly aping the stupid attempts of the Communist enemies of the Empire and all for which it stands, to break up our ranks by calling us "Imperialists." I do not know what they mean by "Imperialist". More than likely they don't either. But of this I am certain; if by the term they mean someone devoted to the achievements in effective international co-operation, in decentralization for the development of true Christian democracy, and in dispensing justice, all to the credit of the British Empire, then I am proud to be called an "Imperialist". If they mean a supporter of the satanic, aggressive and grasping policies of the "Old Lady of Threadneedle Street"; if they mean policies of unrighteous dominion and power over men, of centralization of authority, as well as aggressive offensive war-making to snatch lands or trade privileges, then I disclaim any association whatever with the name "Imperialist". I do distinguish between the British Empire and its magnificent achievements and constructive policies on the one hand, and the Bank of England and its practices, intrigues, and alliances on the other. I am concerned over the future of Britain and the Commonwealth. It would be tragic for this and generations yet unborn if the Commonwealth were to be destroyed, for it has been and is yet a power for good in this world. I do not wish to witness its passing. But can it endure? That is what I will discuss today.

1. *Character of People*

It is only expressing what has become obvious to most honest people, to say that a country or an Empire can be no stronger than the character of its people. But that fact is often overlooked entirely. Last summer I sat at dinner, along with Government dignitaries out at the Ottawa Country Club—a dinner tendered to Field Marshal Montgomery. I heard the great soldier discuss in an address what in his opinion constituted the strength of Canada. He named and explained five factors, in their order of importance, affecting that strength, First and most important amongst these factors was the Character of the People of Canada. I am sure he was right. Likewise, the strength of Empire or of Commonwealth rests first and foremost upon the character of the peoples within it. Hence, it follows that if good character endures the Commonwealth will remain strong and will stand a better chance of enduring down the years.

But what are the ingredients of strong character of a people? We naturally think of things such as honesty sobriety, thrift and so on. Yes, these are obvious elements of ranking importance. But there are some others rarely considered, that also rank as important in that thing called strong national or empire character. I shall mention but a few of them.

Our fathers before us spilled their blood freely in an effort to win and establish securely amongst Anglo-Saxon people, and for all generations to follow, the freedoms we have come to enjoy. They demonstrated that they loved freedom more than they loved life. Thousands gave their lives to win the freedom to speak freely their opinions and criticisms; freedom to worship Almighty God in their own way in their own churches; freedom to take part in their own government; and freedom to live their lives as individuals and not as parts of regimented groups. They fought and won the noble battle against the Divine Right of Kings. Are we now to surrender to the Divine Right of the State? Our fathers hoped and prayed that we their sons would take up the torch and struggle on in an effort to root these freedoms more securely and to extend them, as our legacy to succeeding generations. Our fathers knew that if our attitude towards our freedoms became careless, they would depart from us as surely and as silently as darkness steals upon the world with the setting of the sun. How have we of this generation replied to the challenge of our fathers? Sir Owen Seaman summed up that challenge in these immortal lines:

I SAW THE MORNING BREAK

Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
  Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And trust that out of night and death shall rise
  The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
  That God has given you, for a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have *your* part
  In Freedom's crowning hour;
That you may tell your sons who see the light
  High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
"I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
  I saw the morning break!"

Can we say: "We helped to put the powers of darkness
    to flight
  We saw the morning (of real freedom)
    break?"

It is an ugly fact that our generation has been busy bartering its freedoms for a mess of pottage. We have been too ready to hand over our personal freedoms to the "State" in return for promises of Social Security. Satanic powers behind the scenes have planned scarcities, depressions, wars, punitive taxes, and strife, with the diabolical purpose of crushing our spirit, destroying our moral fibre, so that we will easily yield to the enticements of handouts from a State in return for surrender of dearly-won freedoms. Millions of those who make up the Commonwealth have surrendered to the importunities of mealy-mouthed corrupters who have persisted in advancing the doctrine of the Supreme State—Marxism. They have been blind to the fact that an uncorrupted citizenry can build a great State: but no State ever builds an uncorrupted citizenry. They forgot that no man is politically free who depends upon the State for hand-outs, for the planning of his affairs, and the management of his business. "Statism" fostered by dynamic apostles spawned in the cesspools of Marx, Engels and Lenin, has beaten down initiative, wiped out human industry, destroyed character and prostituted the electors in many parts of the world. The Commonwealth by no means has escaped its evil influence. England, Australia, New Zealand have become tainted. "Statism" has raised its ugly head right here in Canada, and has succeeded in spreading its poison far and wide through the opiate doctrines of Modern Socialism and Bolshevism. They both hold out and pay lip service to "larger freedoms". But it is a lip service only. Let me point out that the policy of compulsion and force which is spreading across the world, everywhere, festered out of Europe largely as a result of the teachings of Marx. Every country which has attempted to go down the road to socialism, baiting its people with the Marxian cry "liberty and equality" has ended up without either "liberty" or "equality". Let us remember that this alien philosophy of "Statism", or "totalitarianism" is always *imposed* upon the people in the name of "liberty" and "equality".

Look at the countries which have followed Marx—Germany with its "National Socialism", Italy with its "Fascist Socialism", and Russia with her "Bolshevistic Socialism". Where are liberty and equality today in these countries? Under the blood and rubble of Socialism! In the beginning every single one of these countries was led to believe that they would have democratic or benevolent socialism. That may have been the honest intention, but it soon became evident that complete State monopoly is the only way socialism can work effectively. But I declare that more class warfare, hatred, anti-semitism, and bloodshed, have festered out of Marxian-Atheistic-Communism than from any other source in history. Marx taught class hatred and warfare, compulsion, force and bloodshed. Christ taught freedom, inducement, and love.

The issue today is Christ or Marx, Christianity or pagan chaos. If our Empire peoples resolutely reject the Marxian appeal to materialism, and if they will rally to the cause of freedom first, our Commonwealth *will* endure. Christ said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all else shall be added unto you". If He were here today He probably would say: "Seek with all your souls, might, mind, and strength to secure the maximum of personal freedom for every individual in the Commonwealth, and all the essentials of Social Security and abundant living will follow as a natural consequence."

It takes strong National or Empire character to reject those things which inevitably contribute to dependence or to moral and spiritual decadence of the individuals comprising it, because the materialistic appeal is very strong. Such attractive slogans as "Social Security", "Planned Economies in the Marxian sense of the term", "Full Employment", etc. appeal mightily to people weary of fighting a hidden enemy that periodically wreaks the havoc of booms, depressions, and wars. But every one of those slogans, if it becomes the major conscious effort of Government, will result in the dependence, moral and spiritual decline, and indeed the enslavement of the people. We can recover and develop strong national character by rallying our people to a mighty, conscious effort to preserve self-reliance, private initiative, personal independence; these constitute the core of moral fibre. A Commonwealth of folks of that calibre will soon be wide awake enough to unite for successful battle against the hidden enemy within our gates. Nothing can crush the Commonwealth built upon the foundation of sound National or Empire Character.

II. *Enemies Within Our Gates*:

Every great country has its enemies. The British Commonwealth, as she became greater year by year, also found enemies rising against her. In this century the worst foes of the British Commonwealth have been those of our own household, as one authority on the subject has said, "Who—some through blindness, some through inertia, some through perfidy—have weakened our resistance to the two most formidable enemies Britain has ever had". Twice in this century we have been in mortal conflict with Prussian Militarism which aimed to strike down and utterly destroy the Empire. By the Grace of Almighty God and through the help of friends, we were able to vanquish the German menace. Since the close of World War 1 we have been at war with the world force we now know was Bolshevism. The attack of this force has been superbly organized and persistent. Composed of a vast army of ruthless enemies of the existing social order, and strangely enough, financed in the initial stages by the same group of world figures who financed Germany's war against us in 1914, and the rise of Hitler twenty years later, Bolshevism or Communism has sought to destroy the Commonwealth because we have stood as the main barrier to its domination of the whole world. What Pan-Germanism failed to do by force of arms, the insidious new force has been trying to do by infiltration, indoctrination, disruption, fear, and diabolical subterfuge.

Bolshevism could have been nipped in the bud in 1918. A prominent Government official in the Netherlands called upon the Nations of the World to rise against it and destroy the evil doctrine in its infancy. Every nation realized at that time that Bolshevism would have to be dealt with before long; even Britain was conscious of this necessity. But no serious and effective action was taken because of the blindness, or inertia, or fear, or perfidy of many of the British people. It is a matter of tragic record that Britain surrendered to Bolshevism, largely as a result of enemies who had been allowed to come or to develop within her gates. Only the awakened conscience of a united people can provide motivation for victorious action, but Britons slept or basked in ignorance and unbelief, or cowered in abject fear while Bolshevism expanded and grew to a force that now threatens the world.

Nor have we in Canada been free from complacency in this respect. We have not been watchful. Many of our people have surrendered to Marxian advances. Canadian authorities, derelict in their duties, watched on while paid agents of Moscow spread their poison and sowed the seeds of popular World Revolution. Bolshevism dug deep in our country before World War II. It spread alarmingly during the "Hungry Thirties".

It is well known that some of the leaders of the movement were interned during the war for deliberately impeding the war effort. Most of them were released when they promised not to continue being naughty boys.

Friendship for Russia Leagues sprang up over the whole country to try to help Canadians to understand the Bolsheviks. Russia gestured with the dissolution of the Third International, but recent investigations have shown that the Communist Party of Canada continued to spread Stalin's plan for Popular World Revolution in spite of all that Britain, the Dominions, and the United States of America were doing to save Russia from the Nazi. Communists penetrated deep into the Armed Forces, the Research Council, into key government positions. This infiltration was drawn to the attention of Canadian Officials by at least one officer in the Canadian Naval Staff Headquarters, as well as by Special Investigation Constables in the R.C.M.P., as early as 1943 and 1944. Yet little or nothing was done to counter the nefarious underground until Gouzenko's sensational revelations in 1945. Even he had finally to appeal to newspapers before he could arouse Canadian officialdom to undertake an investigation.

The Royal Commission's Report on the Bolshevik Espionage in Canada revealed a shocking state of affairs. It confirmed much of what had already been committed in written reports to higher officials months before. It revealed a condition of discordant loyalties in Canada; Canadian-born and very well educated men and women admitted that they had betrayed their country because they felt that they had loyalty to International Communism that took priority over their loyalty to Canada! Here was open-treason as a result of intense Bolshevist influence. But I contend that the officials in high places who allowed these poor wretches to succeed in their nefarious work are just as guilty of treason against Canada and the Empire as are those who have been tried and condemned in our Courts of Law.

It would be too much to expect the Commonwealth to survive the continued undermining influences of these enemies within our gates. We have not been watchful on the ramparts of the Empire! Surely our education in citizenship of late has failed to produce the strong attachments and loyalties necessary for building a great Sisterhood of Nations. And no wonder. The pens and voices of such men as B. K. Sandwell of Toronto Saturday Night activated a wave of international hysteria which rocked Canada during the years of the late war. Its purpose seems to have been to wean away our loyalty to Canada and the Commonwealth and to substitute for it loyalty to some mythical supra-national world state. Is it any wonder then, that we have had here a sorry demonstration of discordant loyalties, and that educated men and women did transfer their attachments to a world Bolshevik ideal? For what other tangible one was there? Education for dynamic and faithful Canadian Citizenship is a must from this day on.

It is now time that Canadians awakened to the dangers facing her. Unitedly, we must set about correcting the conditions in our political, economic, and social life that provided the fertile ground for the growth of Communism. People who are getting the results they want from the management of their affairs are happy, contented people, insulated from subversive influences. Bolshevism always takes deep root and grows fastest amongst frustrated, discontented people who have become embittered through getting from the governmental management of their affairs the results they do not want. It stands to reason, therefore, that the surest antidote to Communism is a revitalized democracy that guarantees social and economic justice to all of its people regardless of race, color, religion or political faith. Democracy is now facing its most exacting test. If it is to survive, this way of life must demonstrate that it can produce for individuals, results which are superior to the results obtainable from any other way of life. I am convinced that democracy and responsible enterprise can render Canadian people immune to any questionable alien philosophy—an immunity that comes from widespread happiness. But we must never allow Canada to fall again upon the evil days of the Hungry Thirties if we hope to put an end to Communistic advances. Our country is one of the great parts of the Empire. It is my belief that she can yet save the day for the whole Commonwealth by cleaning up her own house *now* while there is yet time. A strong Canada, free from Communist disruption, free from inertia and the paralizing fear of totalitarian frightfulness, can very well be the energizing influence towards recovery of an Empire that has suffered paralysis in many of its parts, a paralysis brought on by political "idealists" who may have been sincere, but who certainly have been susceptible to dangerous guidance.

No discussion of the enemies within our gates would be at all complete without some reference to a type of fellow who, though he may not be acting from motives of malevolence or perfidy, nevertheless does succeed in doing as great damage to the Commonwealth spirit as do the Communists by their subversive and disruptive tactics. In Canada we don't have to worry about the chap who doesn't know. He usually holds his counsel. The fellow who does cause infinite trouble is the one who doesn't know he doesn't know. All too often he is a person of moderate or substantial means or of moderately-important position, as a result of which he wields considerable influence in his community. All too often he is himself influenced by slick-sounding slogans that he is fond of throwing around as if he knew what they mean. There are many of them in Canada; doubtless millions of them throughout the Commonwealth. Currently one hears these fellows talking volubly about such things as "Britain's callous disregard of her pledged word to the Jews of the world to help them to establish a national home in Palestine"; "Government at the International Level"; "The

Evils of British Imperialism"; "Empire Trade Preferences Must be Abolished"—and so on. I wish I had time to deal with all of these in some detail to illustrate how crafty disrupters, both within Canada and in other countries, use such slogans to induce an emotional hysteria which spreads like a tidal wave, undermining the Empire and destroying its prestige. Who are these enemies? You will find them in the ranks of the Communists at the bottom, and amongst the International gangsters at the top, both of whom find ready disciples amongst the "don't-know-they-don't-knows" in Canada and other parts of the Commonwealth. But time permits me to mention very briefly but two of them.

The first of these is the Palestine problem. Any well-informed student of the problem knows that Britain has not callously disregarded her pledge to the Jews given in the Balfour Declaration of 1917. After Balfour and Lloyd George yielded to forces and influences against which they appeared to be powerless, it was found that a Military leader had already in 1915, in the name of the British government given pledges to the Arabs which could not be redeemed if that given to the Jews in 1917 were to be fulfilled. Both Jew and Arab have hotly demanded the redemption of Britain's pledges to them, with the result that she has found herself on the horns of a real dilemma. Bolshevik organizations and hotheads in Palestine began to use terrorist methods to back up their persistent demands that Britain open wide the door to Jewish immigration into Palestine. The continuous demands and serious incidents, even during Britain's time of sore trials and her darkest hours in the early part of World War 2 when she needed in the most urgent way the friendship and support of the Arab peoples in the near and middle East and the Moslems of Egypt, weakened the whole Empire and its war effort. When the war ended, as usual Britain was left with the whole complicated and delicate problem to solve by herself, while the "don't-know-they-don't-knows" here and in the United States especially, have continued the undermining process by taking up and repeating the destructive uninformed criticism of Britain. It is obvious that the grave problem of Palestine must be solved soon in a manner which will safeguard the best interests of both Jew and Arab, as well as the Commonwealth interest in the life-line of Empire—the Suez Canal. We all are anxious to see just solution. Until this is an accomplished fact there can be no guarantee of peace in the world, nor of returning vitality and strength to a weakened Empire. But let us all realize how difficult such a solution is to find and to apply to the satisfaction of all concerned. It will be useless to turn the mandate over to the U.N.O. if the nations composing it do not acknowledge "the moral right of the British Empire to survive as a national community with as much security for its welfare and freedom as can be achieved in an insecure and disintegrating world". (Sir Norman Angell.

And now to my last point. On Monday next, the eighth of April, representatives of the nations are to meet in Geneva to draw up a world trade charter. In preparation for that important meeting the enemies of the Commonwealth for months have been spreading the demand that Empire Trade Preferences must be abolished at once. They throw up a smoke screen to hide their real intent by claiming that until Empire Preferences are removed there can be no chance for a fair and expanding world trade. Where does the demand come from? It can be traced to certain interests in various countries, interests that are determined now that Britain is down, to kick the life completely out of her. But the cry of these enemies of the Empire is readily taken up and spread throughout Canada and other countries of the world by the "don't-know-they-don't-knows" who thereby unconsciously lend themselves to the diabolical service of the destroyers, simply because they do not take the trouble to get at the truth.

Now there are certain countries which for some years have been carrying on a very aggressive policy of foreign trade and investment. They have insisted upon favorable balances of exports over imports, and upon leaving these balances for investment in the countries to which they have sent their goods. By way of example, Canada has had difficulty in the past in balancing her payments with the U.S.A. whilst on the other hand we have had a surplus account with other nations. This has been mainly because the U.S.A. refuses to accept imports of Canadian goods sufficient to pay for her exports to Canada. This same policy the United States has insisted upon following with Britain, and some other parts of the Commonwealth. During recent years the United States has attempted to force upon all nations who would trade with her, a most-favored-nation-clause in her trade agreements. The strict application of this clause in her trade relations with Japan was unquestionably one of the important factors which goaded that country into preparing for and declaring war on the United States. The "most-favored-nation" clause is enemy number one of the British Commonwealth today.

Just why do I make that assertion? Let me illustrate the answer by quoting from Ludwell Denny's "America Conquers Britain", page 407:

"We were Britain's colony once. She will be our colony before she is done; not in name, but in fact . . . We shall not make Britain's mistake. Too wise to try to *govern* the world, we shall merely own it. Nothing can stop us. Nothing until our financial empire rots at its heart, as empires have a way of doing. If Britain is foolish enough to fight us, she will go down more quickly, that is all . . . Our weapons are money and machines. The other nations of the world want money and machines. Our materialism, though not power, is not matched by theirs. That is why our conquest is so easy, so inevitable."

There you have the point-of-view of the powerful interests who would destroy Britain and the Commonwealth by the force of trade weapons. How do they propose to do it? They have already gone far in their conquest. Nations of great productive potential, whose goods Britain and Canada and others need to keep up a standard of living, have refused to balance their trade with us by accepting our goods in payment for those they export to us. They have left their favorable balances in our countries for investment in industry and resources, with the result that a very substantial percentage of Canadian and British industry is owned and/or controlled by foreign interests, and consequently our economies among other disabilities, must bear the strain of all the evils of increasing debtor relationship. It is not beyond possibility that what Mr. Denny has forecast, the complete industrial conquest of Britain, will become reality unless world trade policies undergo immediate and radical change.

At the world Conference beginning next week in Geneva it should be laid down as absolutely fundamental that international trade must be a two-way street. Every country should accept the responsibility of receiving imports in full payment for her exports. I think some world pool idea might be worked out that will give full play to desirable multilateral arrangements, but for the sake of future peace and world security all the member nations of the pool will have to be willing to accept in full settlement of their export accounts imports of goods from the pool, thus leaving no nation in their debt.

Thus far Empire Preferences have been fairly effective protection for the members of the Commonwealth against the threat of industrial conquest by other nations. The members of the Commonwealth should unitedly and with stern determination resist the efforts of rivals and enemies to remove them. Empire Preferences should not be removed until all the nations of weaker economies have been provided with adequate safeguards against the impact of nations of great productive potential. Industrially powerful countries must be made to recognize their responsibility in this respect.

Canada should take the lead in rallying the Commonwealth to the support of this ideal. How effectively it is done will determine whether our Commonwealth will survive.

* * *

It is patently clear that the Commonwealth is beset by ruthless enemies from within, and that there must be guiding hands and sinister influences hard at work to destroy her from without. Canada is a major partner in the Empire, hence one of the best guarantees of a strong enduring sisterhood must be a strong, virile, united and independent Canada. We are a land of great opportunities. The Creator endowed us with many supreme gifts. But the measure of our gifts and opportunities make our responsibilities all the greater.

Canadians, today, face the most serious challenge of their lives. It is a challenge to test our spirit and our courage and our strength. To the extent we rise to it and meet it with unflagging faith, to that same extent we contribute to the endurance of the whole Commonwealth.

I have faith in the high destiny and mission of the Commonwealth. There must yet be much for us to accomplish for good in this world, otherwise our lands would not have been preserved for us through successive miracles, the latest of which occurred at Dunkirk in World War 2. There is evidence of an awakening consciousness in all parts of the Commonwealth which does give one hope. We face grave problems and difficulties, it is true, but under Divine guidance I feel sure we will be able to set our various houses in order so that we can go down the years still the great example of harmony and international co-operation for the achievement of peace and abundant living.

"HAS THE BRITISH EMPIRE COMPLETED ITS TASK?

An Address By

COLONEL, THE VEN. ARCHDEACON
A. P. GOWER-REES, M.A., D.C.L., M.C.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, April 10th, 1947

Major Clouse: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and ladies and gentlemen of our air audience (which audience numbers nearly one hundred thousand listeners)—

Eighteen years ago—from this platform—a gentleman whom we all revere, in referring to the desire for world peace, said:

"Before we can arrive at that condition it is very necessary that every nation, every group of people, should realize their part in the larger whole: should strive unitedly and persistently to that common aim".

The author of those words—Rev. Canon Gower-Rees.

Today we are honoured in having as our guest speaker —that same Reverend and Respected Gentleman—The Ven. Archdeacon Gower-Rees. And I can well imagine that at this moment his mind is carried over that span of years to the day when he gave us that profound message— little realizing that eighteen years later the same message with even greater significance must be re-burned into the minds and souls of mankind. And how appropriate that the title of today's address should be—

"Has the British Empire completed its task?".

The Ven. Archdeacon Gower-Rees graduated as a Master of Arts from Christ's College, Cambridge, in 1908. He was ordained in Yorkminster and was Canon of Bradford Cathedral and Rector of Bolton in Yorkshire. During the first World War he served in the field through France, Belgium and Germany and was Assistant Chaplain-General of the Army of Occupation. Following the signing of the Treaty of Versailles he held service and preached in Cologne Cathedral. For Meritorious Action in the Field he was awarded the Military Cross and was mentioned five times in despatches. In 1927 he came to Canada, accepting the appointment of Rector of St. George's Anglican Church and Archdeacon of Montreal.

In World War II Col. Gower-Rees served as Naval Chaplain in the Montreal district.

It is my privilege to re-introduce to the members of The Empire Club of Canada:

Colonel, The Venerable Archdeacon A. P. Gower-Rees, M.A., D.C.L., M.C.

Mr. Chairmen and Gentlemen:

I deeply appreciate the warm welcome you have so kindly expressed, and in return I wish to acknowledge your gracious confidence in entrusting to me the responsible task of offering a reasonable answer to the very pertinent question.

Has the Empire fulfilled its task? It is a question implied, if not definitely and bluntly asked, in the voluminous observations with reference to the present situation of the Empire, which have been given world-wide publicity in the Press of almost every nation. The attention and thought of the reading public cannot fail to be focussed by such insinuating expressions and questions as "the Empire is passing into history", "this crumbling Empire", "the liquidation of the British Empire", "How long will the liquidation process last?", "When did the decay of the British Empire begin?" The severity of the mental impact produced by such expressions varies in effect according to the quality, and depth of the racial loyalties or prejudices of the reader.

On March 17th at Richmond, Virginia, Lord Inverchapel, the British Ambassador to the U.S.A. was reported in the New York Times to have said in an address prepared for the English-Speaking Union and the Richmond Public Forum, "I may be obtuse and slow-witted but I fail to follow the arguments of people who say that our guts have withered and shrivelled within us, and that we have lost our power and will to work. History has shown that the British people possess in a remarkable way just those few inches of guts that make all the difference.

Believe me, those extra few inches are still with us and will carry us out of the present crisis as they have carried us out of far greater and graver crisis in the past. He said questions clearly stirring the minds of the American people today were, "What is happening to Britain? Is she collapsing? Is the British Commonwealth breaking up, and is the British Empire falling to pieces?" "Here and there", he went on to say, "I am being taunted with *not* being a realist, because whilst I recognize there is a crisis in the domestic affairs of Britain I reject, with all the strength at my command, any suggestion that we are finished as a world power and that we are incapable of overcoming the difficulties which six years of bombardment, of submarine blockade, of overwork and dull food have left us." Having recounted Britain's achievements since V-J. Day he said, "In spite of our difficulties, and they are many and grave, we are determined to take our full share in the building of a free world. We shall not flinch from one of our tasks. We welcome and are grateful for the way in which others are coming to our aid in lightening our century-old duty of being the *watch-dog* of the world."

I venture, gentlemen, at once to declare that those sentiments, forcibly expressed, are the sentiments not only of every member of this Empire Society, but of every loyal citizen of the Empire.

Without further delay, I will now come to the question of the day. "Has the Empire fulfilled its tasks?"

You will all concede that an adequate and satisfactory answer to that question requires wide historical knowledge, and a professional historian's penetrating eye and analytical ability.

Lest you be tempted in your generous hearts to assume that I possess such a qualification, I feel compelled to confess that I am but an amateur historian, just an ordinary observer of events, ever seeking to understand and correlate events and movements which are the pieces of the jig-saw puzzle of human history. Now what we want to know is whether the Empire has up to the present fulfilled its purpose in the world. I believe it will be found helpful towards a better understanding if I substituted the word "purpose" for "tasks".

It would be also helpful if I explained here, why the word Commonwealth is used in these days in place of the word Empire. It is used because I believe it denotes more correctly than the word Empire what the great State to which we all belong really is.

In one sense the British Empire is *still* an Empire today, for the sovereign power is vested in an Imperial Parliament, which still exercises more or less autocratic power over vast territories in the world. In another sense it is *not* an Empire because the Imperial Parliament has long ago abdicated its title to legislate for the self-governing Dominions, which, by the Statute of Westminster, 1931, have attained an equality of status with the Mother Country. But what is more important, I think, than the technical meaning of words—it is a Commonwealth, because the feeling of the overwhelming majority of its inhabitants is that the justification for its existence can never be that it is of benefit to any one section of its inhabitants at the expense of the rest, but that it ensures internal peace, law, and order to its myriad inhabitants and affords to all of them the best hope of self-government and progress. In fact, we should most of us cease to believe in the Empire unless we also believed that it was becoming more and more of a *Commonwealth*, by giving in increasing degree, *equal rights* and *equal opportunities* to all its citizens, while at the same time it imposed upon them their correlatives—*equal burdens* and *equal responsibilities.*

What, then, is the use and purpose of the British Commonwealth in the world? This I think can best be considered under three heads.

I. The primary function of the British Empire is to maintain the reign of law; and because of it to keep the peace among a quarter of the people of the earth.

Has it succeeded in doing so? Two World Wars in 30 years has made it much more clear what an enormous important service the Empire has done in introducing ordered relations between 430 million people who, in the hour of peril, rallied together as one united people to resist the Teutonic bid for world domination. The British Commonwealth is a form of international government, which has kept the peace among a quarter of mankind. It has developed a sense of unity which prevents the nationalism within its boundaries from degenerating into pure bigotry, and it has provided the means whereby the disputes between the communities of every race and color and grade of civilization of which it is composed, can be settled by law and not by force.

That in itself has been a tremendous contribution not only to our own peace but to the peace of the world.

Though its constitutional machinery has not been perfectly contrived for discharging that function, yet so long as the Empire remains one State, that machinery, imperfect though it may be, is there to be used whenever required.

II. The second function of the British Commonwealth is one which has not been fully appreciated.

It is the great bridge between East and West and between all the grades of civilization which exist upon the face of the globe. Some people have been inclined to regard the British Raj in India as something in itself, wicked; something to be maintained, because having once been created it could not be suddenly overthrown, but to be apologized for, and to be got rid of as quickly as possible. Those are people who would assent to the view that the Empire was the product of the desire for domination of our ancestors and of no laudable purpose at all. I believe that if they will study history they will find that such opinions are wholly unwarranted.

There are many black or rather I would say, grey pages in Anglo-Indian history,—there are many things which could have been greatly improved; but I do not believe that any dispassionate enquirer would deny that the establishment of the British Raj has not only been a benefit to India but has been a necessary stage in the upward progress of the world. It is only possible to realize this, by considering what happens as the result of the first contact between civilization as we know it in the West and an ancient Asiatic civilization or a primitive African community. The result is almost invariably chaos. Whatever form the contact takes, whether it be the introduction of new ideas by the missionary, of drink, firearms and the implements of civilization by the trader, or of money and organization by the financier and speculator, the result is always the same,—the earlier civilization crumbles into ruins. Only in the case of the Japanese has an Eastern civilization been able to accommodate itself to the terrible impact of the knowledge and enterprise of the West; and the Japanese did so only by practically rebuilding their national life on Western lines. When such a chaos falls upon primitive backward peoples, and when there seems to be no prospect of their re-establishing peace and security for life and property, for themselves,—the only way was for some civilized nation to step in and protect the inhabitants from being exploited by so-called civilized adventurers and put an end to evils, which, if unchecked, could only destroy and barbarize the people, by maintaining order and just law, until such time as the people have learnt how to govern themselves under the new conditions created by Western knowledge and ways.

It has been and still is a most important function of the British Commonwealth to maintain justice and liberty among nearly 400 million people who were not able to protect themselves from the devastating influences of the foreign adventurers and speculators—and who had not re-adapted their primitive or their ancient societies to the new conditions which constant contact with the West had brought into being.

The regulation of that contact has not been perfect. In particular the relations between individuals of white races and coloured races are still undesirably bad. But none the less the British Commonwealth, with all its imperfections, has in a remarkable way succeeded in creating the conditions in which—free self-development and progress are possible—and also providing the means whereby contact between all grades of civilization can be adjusted by conference and compromise, ending in legislation binding on all, instead of by war.

III. The third purpose of the British Commonwealth should need but little explanation after our experience of two World Wars in 30 years. The fact of its unity has not only saved the communities of which it is composed, from invasion and possible loss of independence; but it has already made practically certain the triumph of the ideals of democracy and freedom and the vindication of public right in the world.

It was no small thing that the existence of the British Commonwealth should have in such an astonishing manner mobilized its vast resources in men and material to resist the mightiest military onslaught ever made on human freedom and public right. History will certainly record that it was the existence of the British Commonwealth and the alacrity of its peoples to defend the right which was the principal factor in defeating the German attempts to impose a military tyranny on the world. In saying that, I am not for a moment unmindful of or ungrateful to our great and valiant Allies who later came to our aid and made victory certain. Therefore, I submit, gentlemen, that the British Empire and Commonwealth has hitherto fulfilled its task in the world and will continue to do so despite the ominous and disturbing aspects of the present situation.

It has ensured personal liberty and the reign of law over a quarter of the globe,—it has been the chief instrument for adjusting the relations between East and West by peaceful means, it has been the chief bulwark of freedom and public right in the world.

That does not mean that the British Commonwealth as it exists today is perfect. The room for improvement in its administration and its laws is practically infinite.

But it does mean that the true line of progress is to *improve* the British Commonwealth, and *not* to *dissolve* it. To break it up would simply be to set back the hands of the clock of progress. It would destroy the best agency which exists today for training peoples still practically backward in liberal democracy,—and it would mean handing them over to some autocratic power, which would not only teach them some illiberal Kultur, but would utilise their resources and their man-power to overthrow liberty itself. It would sunder communities and races who are now united in allegiance to one another and leave them with no other means of official intercourse, save diplomacy backed by armaments; and thereby increase the possibilities of further wars.

It would put an end to the only practical proof which exists today that it is possible to unite all races and all levels of civilization and all the ends of the earth in one State, within which every disputed question is settled by reason and justice expressed in *law,* and not by *force.* Hence I suggest to you that it is the primary duty of every good citizen not only to be an active citizen of his own national community, which to us is Canada, but also to be an active citizen of the British Commonwealth as well:—not only to make our own country a better place to live in, but to help to make the Empire also a better place for all its inhabitants to live in and a more effective instrument for the maintenance of freedom and public right in the world.

There are two subjects which events have forced to the front in recent years, and which, as they concern the fundamentals of the Imperial constitution, may threaten the disruption of the Commonwealth unless they are handled wisely.

The first relates to the introduction of self-government to India. The conduct of the government of India by the British terminates in June, 1947.

It has long been recognized that British government in India could only be a transitional episode in the history of India. It could have no finality in itself. The justification for British rule in India must be that it has served to tide over the period while India was adjusting itself and its ideas to Western ideas, and that it ended in the creation of a self-governing Dominion within the Commonwealth by constitutional and peaceful and *not* revolutionary means. It would be well for us to bear in mind that the introduction of self-government is not the same thing as the establishment of democratic machinery. Self-government is a thing of the spirit far more than of constitutional mechanics. It requires, before it can be brought successfully into operation, not only a considerable degree of education among the majority of the voters, but such a standard of political conduct among them as will ensure they put the interests of the community above their own interests or those of the section or class to which they belong.

The greatest obstacle at present in the way of a successful democracy in India, is not the opposition of British officialdom but religious prejudice, the almost impassable barriers of caste which separate the people into strata which have practically no connection with one another; and the illiteracy of the overwhelming mass of the Indian population. We can only realize what a colossal task confronts the Indian leaders when we remember that India which is as large as Europe without Russia and whose 350,000,000 inhabitants are infinitely divided by religion and caste, are grouped into races as different from one another as are the races of Europe, and speak more different languages than are spoken in Europe and of whom the overwhelming majority are still totally incapable of exercising the franchise. Much has been done under British Rule in India to lay the foundations for ultimate self-government. Much more has yet to be done by the Indian leaders to achieve it. But self-government is much more than democratic machinery and the road to it will not be fully travelled until many a difficult problem has been carried into effect by the Indians themselves. Now faced with the entire responsibility for settling their political and religious differences, the Indian leaders are already finding the process rather painful. I am sure we all wish them every success in their endeavours and we shall be ready to extend to India a whole-hearted welcome as a self-governing Dominion within the British Commonwealth.

The other problem to which I can only make a brief reference, concerns the constitution of a central *Imperial Parliament* for the British Commonwealth.

I am of the opinion that the pressure, not only of enthusiasts or of constitution-makers, *but of facts,* is driving us to a federal constitution which will create an Imperial Parliament representative of the whole Empire to deal with the common affairs of the Commonwealth while guaranteeing the autonomy of all parts, *as the alternative* to the disruption of the Empire.

The method of co-operation has worked astoundingly well for many years—but sooner or later as all history seems to show, it is certain to break down. And when it does break down we shall be faced with the alternatives—*federation* or *disruption*—with no via media between.

We are perilously near such a crisis now when the process of disintegration appears to be going on before our eyes. I am of the opinion that the time has come to choose the road of federation and not the road of disruption. I say that, because I believe that the unity of the British Commonwealth is still the greatest single political service which we can render to the cause of peace, to our fellows and to mankind.

The British Commonwealth and Empire is today a necessity to the world; its importance for Europe lies in the fact that it is the champion of the world supremacy of the White Man. There is nothing more shortsighted than the belief that any European country whatever could benefit by a weakening of the British Empire. The future of the British Commonwealth is the future of the White Man. Its future is of the greatest consequence for the whole of humanity.

One thing is certain; the British Commonwealth and Empire will last just as long as its spiritual basis remains a living and effective force and no longer; but the end of it will also be the end of the world-wide rule of the White Man.

I am afraid that I have touched today but lightly on matters of vital importance but I hope that what I have said will help some of you at least to realize more clearly what is the use and purpose of our British Commonwealth in the world.

In any case I trust that you will feel that the Commonwealth of which you and I are citizens is not something in itself essentially evil but essentially good; not to be *apologized for,* but to be *proud of,* not to be *pulled down, liquidated* or *disrupted;* but to be *built up,* and *improved* and *perfected* so that it may continue to fulfil its task in the world even better in the future than in the past. I should be the first to admit its defects and lapses; but I am not yet convinced that the world can afford to do without it.

We cannot appreciate the full significance of the British Commonwealth or the full significance of the closer unity of its peoples until we consider their relations with the outside world. The British Commonwealth is the standing denial of the doctrines which have caused not only the devastation of Europe but of other parts of the world. It is a living proof that unity comes not of force, but of justice and law, not of self-concentration but of mutual service. It proves no less that peace is the fruit not of jealousy and selfishness but of a brotherhood which can transcend the narrower claims of race and nationality and colour. If it were to break up, it would be the greatest calamity which could befall mankind. But it will not break up.

We must all labour to leave that great fabric, the British Commonwealth and Empire, a nobler, freer and juster Commonwealth than we found it and thus prove ourselves not unworthy trustees of so great a heritage.

"THE MAKING OF THE PEACE"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. E. T. SALMON, M.A., Ph.D.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, April 17, 1947.

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen of the Empire Club of Canada and ladies and gentlemen of our audience of the air: Last Sunday, in speaking from London, Eng., over the B.B.C., Henry A. Wallace, vice-president of the U.S.A., told his audience: "There will be no peace until the whole world gets a "New Deal" on the Roosevelt model. Do you recall that Roosevelt model? I will remind you—in March, 1940, the late President Roosevelt, speaking from Washington, said:

'Today we seek a moral basis for peace. It cannot be a real peace if it fails to recognize brotherhood. It cannot be a lasting peace if the fruits of it are oppression, starvation, or cruelty, or human life dominated by armed camps. It cannot be a sound peace if small nations must live in fear of powerful neighbours. It cannot be a moral peace if freedom from invasion is sold for tribute. It cannot be an intelligent peace if it denies free passage to that knowledge of those ideals which permit men to find common ground. It cannot be a righteous peace if worship of God is denied.' "

The title of today's address "The Making of the Peace". It is our good fortune today to welcome as our guest of honour a scholar, a linguist and a keen student of international affairs.

Dr. Salmon was born in London, England, educated in Sydney, New South Wales and received his B.A. degree from the University in Australia. He later graduated from Cambridge University, receiving his M.A. and Ph.D., to be followed by post graduate studies in Italy. Since 1930 Dr. Salmon has occupied the chair of Professor of Ancient History at McMaster University. He has for quite some time been the news commentator on station CKOC.

It is my pleasure and privilege to introduce Dr. E. T. Salmon, M.A., Ph.D.

Dr. E. T. Salmon: Mr. President, Members of The Empire Club of Canada, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Radio Audience: In rising to speak to you about the making of the peace after the Second World War, I suppose that the first thing that I could do would be to state a truism. Everybody must be profoundly aware of the difference in atmosphere that exists between the year 1947 and the year 1920. Two years after the First World War I think it is true to say most people were very greatly relieved. They thought that the war to end war had been fought. They thought the Armagageddon was behind them. They had supreme confidence that the League of Nations was going to make any renewal of a holocaust absolutely impossible.

Yet, now, just two years after the Second World War we are living in no such optimistic atmosphere. This time there is no feeling that we fought a war to end all wars. This time there is not, I venture to suggest, a great deal of confidence in that fledgling organization of the United Nations.

There have been since the Second World War ended a large number of international conferences. Those conferences have been marked by a good deal of acrimony, a good deal of name-calling, a good deal of villification, and even of downright abuse. No doubt it can be said, that many, if not most, international conferences are characterized by something of that sort. Even the Peace Conference at the end of the First World War was not entirely free of such distressing occurrences. You will doubtless all remember how during that Peace Conference the Italian Delegation became so indignant at some of what it considered to be injustices that it packed up its bags and walked out of the Conference and went home.

So that people last time, when a much better atmosphere austensibly prevailed than today, still showed a good deal of ill feeling at the Peace Conference.

But this time, so it seems to me at least, the ill feeling is unusually great. This time the display of bad temper is, so it seems to me, very marked. To a certain extent, that can, I think, be explained to the tremendous degree of importance that has been attached to a slogan that was first originated by President Wilson at the end of the First World War. On that occasion President Wilson in arriving at Paris announced that he was going to insist upon "Open Covenants Openly Arrived At."

Now, no one in his senses would raise the slightest objection to open convenants. Secret treaties and all that they stand for must be condemned. I think it is monstrous that any nation, probably without its knowledge of will should be committed to something in a secret document in a treaty, in a treaty of a secret document. It might be in that way a nation might be committed without its knowledge or consent, to a course of action which might involve it in national disaster, or it might be that the nation without its knowledge or consent had pledged its word to a course which subsequently might involve it in national dishonour.

So there is a great deal indeed to be said for open covenants. But to arrive at them openly is another matter indeed. We sometimes tend to forget that peacemaking is not a parliamentary procedure. At Ottawa in Canada we have our National Parliament, and there the representatives from the various constituencies and districts can get up and speak their minds and finally a decision is made on the basis of majority voting. That, however, is not the way it is done in international affairs. That is not the way it is done at a Peace Conference. A Peace Conference, in essence, involves bargaining. Each Nation is represented there by individual men, and sometimes women, and their jobs is to confer with their opposite members from other Nations and work out a deal with them. One Nation will be expected to give a little here in order to gain something there. All that, I would suggest, involves a great deal of bargaining, and bargaining cannot be conducted openly. There has to be a great deal of secrecy about it. It is a confidential procedure and only if the delegates can carry on with the knowledge that every word they say is not going to be blazoned forth will they really speak their mind freely.

Now, since the end of the First World War, this slogan about open covenants being arrived at openly has gained very wide currency and the result is at the end of the Second World War we have seen an attempt actually to put that slogan into force. Now this has involved a good deal of mutual abuse by the various delegates. It has involved a talking to one's own nation instead of talking to the representatives of other Nations. If at a Peace Conference the representative of Great Britain knows that every word he says will immediately be broadcast to the far winds, then there is only one thing he can do. Then he must make every word he says acceptable to the people of Great Britain. So half the time he is not even bothering to talk to the members of the other delegations. He is putting himself on record for the benefit of the people back home. And that is true of every delegate at the Conference.

I think myself that it would be much better if we did indeed have open covenants, but that the old system whereby they were arrived at through confidential processes would be very much better. I might say that lately there is a tendency for that procedure to be restored. At the early conferences in Paris and for instance at the United Nations Organization at New York, or at Lake Success, the open procedure was adhered to as well. Now here at Moscow, we find there is a growing tendency to have closed sessions. Personally, I think it is all to the good.

However, I should express here and now, that it is not merely the difficulty of arriving at understanding, under this method, of arriving at covenant openly, that is chiefly to blame for the somewhat tense atmosphere in which the world is living today. It is not only that at all. Let us be perfectly frank. Let us call a spade a spade and say quite candidly that the reason the atmosphere is so tense today is that Russia is present at the Peace Conference.

Russia, at least so it seems to me, is evidently determined to be disagreeable. They are extremely secretive. They won't speak out, they won't share knowledge. Even during the time when we were their fighting Allies at war, they gave us none of their secrets, even though they willingly accepted any secrets that we turend over to them. We have Mr. Churchill's word for it that we turned over to them such secrets as radar, whereas they in return gave us nothing. They are not only secretive, they can be abusive. When the Moscow Conference opened, practically the first statement Mr. Molotov made was to raise a storm of abuse against Britain and the United States.

Not only are they abusive, they are also obstructionists. You can see that from their attitude toward the Atomic Commission. At one time it seemed as though they were prepared to an International Commission on Atomic Energy, which of course, would involve international inspection. I would say, at one time, it seemed as though they were going to agree to that. And suddenly, Mr. Gromyko announces he will do nothing of the sort.

Not only are they obstructionist, they are also expansive. Since 1939, let us remember, Russia has acquired a good deal of territory that she did not possess hitherto. She has taken over the former Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania. She has taken over a slice of Finland. She has taken over a considerable portion of the State of Poland, as it existed before 1939, including some sections of Poland that had never been Russian in the whole of history before that time. She has taken a bit of what used to be Czechoslovakia. She has taken a bit of what used to be Rumania. And, in this particular, I think it is fair to say, she has not merely been recovering territory which she could legitimately claim as her own. Some of it, so it seems to the observer on this side of the ocean, is grabbing of territory merely for grabbing's sake.

Take the case of Rumania. Russia in June of 1940, demanded that Rumania surrender the Province of Bessarabia, and the neighbouring province of Bukovina. Roumania complied. The Russian troops therefore moved in and getting from Bessarabia to Bukovina, had to traverse a small section of the ancient Rumanian Province of Moldavia. Subsequently, they were asked to restore that section of the province, not included in their original demand, but they refused to vacate even though the territory in dispute was so small you would have thought it wasn't worth while a mightly country like Russia bothering with it. So far as I know they are still in that portion of Moldavia, and I understand it has been annexed to the Soviet Union.

So there are all those factors in front of us. What do they add up to? Well, you all know that the former candidate for the American Presidency, Mr. Wendell Willkie once produced a book called "One World". It hardly needs Mr. Willkie to tell us that advances in aeronautics and the field of science generally have narrowed the physical boundaries of the world. It is possible to get from one place to another with incredible speed and rapidity today. But merely because transportation has been accelerated in that way is no proof that we are in actual fact living in one world.

Just look around us today. Who would dare say that there is only one world? Do you believe in Mr. Winston Churchill's phrase about an iron curtain? Whether you do or not, it is pretty clear that you do not have freedom of access, you do not have free transmission of news. You do have the world divided.

The Slavic nations of Eastern Europe and Russia accuse the nations of the west of forming a Western Bloc. Actually, the accusation is without grounds because if you look at the proceedings of many International Conferences, you will find that it is very, very rare indeed that the nations of the west vote unanimously. As often as not New Zealand will vote against Great Britain and I think you all realize that Australians are not exceptionally noted for the way that they will follow somebody else's lead.

Actually, there is, a Slavic Bloc. The Slavs themselves glory in this fact. They have had various Slavic Conferences since the end of the war. If you look for example in this morning's newspaper, published in this city of Toronto, you will find, if I remember correctly, on the vèry front page, a despatch from Warsaw which reads as follows: "The Foreign Minister of the Polish Government is certain that Poland's Western Frontier will be effected along the line of the rivers Oder and Dneister".

This border, according to him, will be the border not only of Poland, but of all Slav countries. So that is as good as an admission of a Slavic bloc.

Opposing that there is not as yet any Western Bloc, so called. But it is, I think pretty good evidence that the world is indeed not one world.

As Walter Lippman, the well known American publicist, also in this morning's Toronto newspaper, put it, there are now two worlds.

Now, I might say that all of this is nothing very new. It all has a very, very familiar ring. After all, how different is the policy of Soviet Russia from the policy of Czarist Russia? I know of course that the personnel has changed. It is not the same men directing affairs in Russia today. I know too that their economic way of running their own country has been altered. I am aware that the administration inside Russia is different from what it was in the old Czarist days, but neevrtheless I seriously ask the question, how different was the foreign policy of Czarist Russia from the foreign policy of Soviet Russia?

If you look at history, I think you will find that Russia always was more or less cut off from the west, just as she is today. Russia always was a very secretive country. Russia always was a country despotically ruled. Russia always was a country where conditions were primitive in the most brutal way. Russia in the 19th century at least showed the same desire to expand as she seems to be showing today. You all know about the drive toward the Dardanelles and the drive toward warm water ports that was so marked a feature of the foreign policy of Imperial Russia in the 19th century. I might say that Russia in the past was obstructionist and difficult to deal with just as she is today.

We know of these things from the simple fact that this is not the first time that Russia has participated with us in a peace conference at the end of a great World War. Russia participated in the Peace Conference at the end of the great World War which we usually call the Napoleonic War. On that occasion too, Russia's behavior was extraordinarily similar to the behavior of Russia today.

No doubt many of you will have read that book by the great English publicist and Liberal and former Diplomatic servant, Harold Nicholson, a book that appeared just a few months ago, dealing with the Congress of Vienna at the end of the Napoleonic War. I will quote a little from that book. In that book he says, "It was indeed true that Russia having endured hard suffering and achieved magnificent triumphs was assuming an attitude of arrogant secretiveness which caused dismay in her partners in the quadruple alliance".

That is not spoken of the Russia today, but of the Russia of over 100 years ago.

I will quote a speech of a well known statesman: "To re-establish Poland, in order to give it entirely to Russia and extend the frontiers of Russia to the Oder would mean creating so great an imminent danger for Europe that if its execution could only be stopped by force or arms, not a single moment should be lost in taking them up."

That is not spoken by a statesman today. It is the year 1816.

Here is another quotation from a speech: "We ought to avoid irritating Russia by a pertinacious opposition which is unlikely to be successful".

That again sounds as if it were spoken by a statesman of today, when in actual fact it was spoken by a statesman of over 130 years ago.

In actual fact, the tenseness, the excitement that prevailed in Britain on the aftermath of the Napoleonic War was very much greater than the tenseness that prevails today. In 1816 the average man in Britain was very much alarmed whether he wouldn't be at war with Russia in 24 hours. Today no one in his senses thinks that Russia and ourselves are going to be at war like that.

Now, even though there was that extremely tense atmosphere in 1816, even though everybody did feel in Britain at any rate, that war once again was just around the corner, war was averted.

Peace was made, a deal was worked out that endured 100 years. It was true that that was not a peace that was absolutely universal. There has been no such thing as universal peace since the dawn of recorded history, but it is true that for the 100 years from 1815 to 1914 the world did escape world wide conflict. That is an achievement that we should remember, especially when we bear in mind that that was achieved in the atmosphere that prevailed immediately after the Napoleonic War. If that achievement could be brought about in the kind of atmosphere that existed in 1818 shouldn't a somewhat similar achievement be produced in the less tense atmosphere that prevails today? Cannot some deal be worked out?

Now, I am aware of course that many people say that it is impossible to come to an agreement with the Communist Party which is in charge in Russia today, that the Communist Party and the Members have no scruples, that they don't do things the way we do them, and that in fact it is just impossible to get along with them.

Now then, if that is so, if it is true that we cannot work out a deal with them, then logically there is only one thing for us to do. Logically, if we cannot come to an agreement with them we should be at war with them already. That would be the logical situation. In other words, we should be dropping atomic bombs on them already if it is true we can't work out a deal with them. Yet everybody in this room and everybody beyond this room knows we are not going to be dropping atomic bombs on them immediately, that we have no intention of dropping atomic bombs on them. In other words, whether we like it or not, we have got to try and make a deal with them.

Now there are two ways of doing it. We can either win the Russians over to our side by the use of sweetness and reason. By appealing, shall we say, to their better instincts, and appealing to their generosity, and saying, "Well, we are decent fellows, you are decent fellows, let us sit down together and work this thing out". That is one way of doing it.

The other way is to be extremely tough and brutal and see if we can't extract from them a concession which they will only give through the method of force, which happens to be, I think, their own method of extracting concessions. Now I might say it is my own conviction we have already tried to use the former method. We have already tried to use the soft answer that turneth away wrath. In the record of our collaboration with them in wartime, we know the tremendous outpouring of goodwill that featured our relations with them up until a few months ago and we know that that is no longer the case. We know that all of that seems to have gone for nought. In fact it begins to look as if we would be guilty of appeasement if we made any further gentle steps. Appeasement didn't work in the case of Nazi Germany or Fascist Italy. It seems very doubtful if it will work in the case of Soviet Russia. In fact there are some of us who would think it has already failed pretty badly. All you have to do is look at the United Nations Organizations. The Russians, it is true have joined that, but they seemed to have joined merely to demonstrate its futility.

If Britain, for example, seeks to investigate the placing of mines in the Korfu Channel off the coast of Albania, what happens? The Russians veto the whole proposition to make sure their stooge government in Albania shall not be arraigned. It looks just from that single instance, apart altogether from their failure to join such organizations as UNESCO, it looks as though the policy of appeasement won't work with them any more than it will work with other nations.

Well, what about using different methods? Methods of firmness? Many observers have noted how the Russians respect firmness. I won't give a lot of examples. One example will suffice. During the war, Lieut.-General Sir Gifford Martell, formerly Commanding Officer of the Royal Armoured Corps in the British Army, took charge of the British Mission in Moscow, actually in April of 1943. His job was to see that military liaison should be established. At the time he took over the job, in April of 1943, when already Russia had been in the war for two years, and military liaison at that time did not exist.

Recently in a book just published in England, General Martell has told us of his experiences. He says that the military liaison did not exist when he arrived in Moscow in April of 1943. Therefore, he decided to get tough with the Russians and he achieved some results.

During an early visit which he paid to the Russian front, the Soviet Commander wanted to withhold facts about Russian disposition and strength. General Hartell, trying to look angry, spoke out strongly and said: "Do you imagine I have come all the way from England to put up with tomfoolery of that sort? I have never been so insulted before in my life. I don't intend to put up with that kind of nonsense". Whereupon the information was handed over to him. He felt confirmed in his policy of toughness. He pursued that policy for four months and got along pretty well with the Russians with that method.

At the end of the four months, on orders from on high, that goodwill was to be substituted for toughness, that was the end of liaison.

The moral would appear to be that firmness is required. I, personally, don't think that the Russian leading men, like Mr. Molotov, Mr. Vishinski, and higher still, Mr. Stalin, I don't think that any of those men will be seriously offended if we start to use the method they use already. I know for the record, papers like "Pravda" and "Izvestia" will come out with some pretty nasty comments, but these men themselves will respect us for doing exactly what they do. In fact, I might suggest, they might be highly flattered. Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

At the moment, if a policy of firmness like this is to be pursued in an effort to work out a peace deal, and as you all know, simply from reading the papers during the past few days, a deal hasn't yet been worked out, at least for Germany, if a deal is to be worked out by methods of toughness and firmness, who is to do it? Britain at the moment is going through a period of weakness. You only have to look at the crisis that developed there owing to the shortage of coal only a few weeks ago. Already she has announced that she will be withdrawing from India and Burma. She has tried to put the problem of Palestine on the doorstep of the United Nations, and she has announced that the burden in Greece is beginning to be something that she finds extremely difficult to carry. Accordingly, it would look as if, to use a rugby metaphor, the ball will have to be carried by the United States.

Now, as a matter of fact, the United States already is beginning to act in a rather tough manner. You all remember that on March 12th, the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, enunciated the program which has since become known as the "Truman Doctrine". You probably have all noted that he brought forth this manifestation, at a special time.

You have probably all noted that when General Marshall, as the Secretary of State of the United States arrived in Moscow, he didn't pay a visit to Mr. Stalin, and as a matter of fact for a long time behaved as if Mr. Stalin didn't exist. It is true during that period Mr. Stalin was visited by what I would call a number of "lesser fry" from the United States, but General Marshall didn't go near him or even seek an interview until a couple of days ago. To some of us that looks pretty much like a snub.

Now there is no doubt that all of this indicates increasing firmness on the part of the United States. It does of course, also put an end to, shall we say, the historical American doctine of isolation and freedom of entanglement in European affairs.

However, I think it is also fair to state that we ought not to be under any illusion about the so-called "Truman Doctrine". It is a good deal less sensational when you examine it carefully than it seems to be at first glance. What the President is asking for, is an appropriation of $400,000,000 which is to be used to bolster Greece and Turkey. Well, what is $400,000,000? Britain, since the liberation of Greece, has poured almost that sum into Greece alone, apart from anything that Turkey may have got. Furthermore, even though the President does call for $400,000,000 to support these countries he made his statement at a time when he knew that compulsory military training was on the way out in the United States, and I have no doubt that the fact was not overlooked in Moscow, that on the 31st, of March, just about three weeks after the President's speech, the conscription system was due to come to an end in that great Republic.

In other words, that is as good as admitting that there is to be no Armed Force to back up the Truman Doctrine. It is even possible, it is conceivable that the Congress may reject the President's proposal. It certainly has not been carried through with the speed and the despatch that the President hoped. So you can see that the whole move is, shall we say, not quite so forward a step as it at first glance appeared to be.

When Mr. Wallace, the former Vice-President of the United States goes off on a crusading tour in Great Britain and elsewhere and in effect compares Mr. Truman's speech to a declaration of war, I can only think that Mr. Wallace is only extremely naive or else must be becoming a little fanatical in his views.

What does the Truman Doctrine signify? If it is not being backed up by force, I think it means that the United States is beginning to talk tough in order to force an agreement. If it is true that the United States hasn't the force at the moment or won't have within the next few weeks to back up the Truman document, it is equally true that Russia at the moment hasn't the force she disposed of at the war's end. Russia too, has been demobilized. So it is really an attempt, I think, to make sure that agreed spheres of interest, agreed vital interests should be defined. The Americans, I think, are adopting this line in order to find some agreement with the Russians.

The agreements of Teheran and Yalta, undoubtedly contained many ambiguities. You can see that from the considerable argument that has been raised about them ever since, with Mr. Molotov interpreting in one way, and Mr. Byrnes or General Marshall interpreting in another way. In other words, it is high time some agreement was reached that was free of ambiguity. The Truman Doctrine, I think, gives an opportunity for the Americans and the Russians really to get down to cases, and the Americans know where the Russians stand, and the Russians know where the Americans stand, and in that way some kind of deal might be worked out.

If you look once again to this morning's paper, to the column describing the doings of General Marshall in Moscow, you will see that it is the concensus of opinion of observers on the spot in the Russian capital.

Now, if agreement is to be reached with Russia, and it is only by reaching agreement with Russia a peace can be made, I suggest it can be done only by a policy of firmness. We don't need to respect the feelings of the Communists in the matter, any more than they will respect our feelings. If we are firm, if the policy of toughness is pursued, then some deal can be worked out and in that way there might be a lasting peace.

I don't think this will be easy, and I don't profess to be able to outline the sort of peace that it will be. One thing seems perfectly certain. That is that any peace obtained by those methods will be essentially a negative peace. You will have one nation saying to another nation, "You shall not do this". You will have the other nation replying, "All right, we won't do that, if you in turn don't do something else".

The dangers of a negative peace of that sort are perfectly obvious. There have been many negative peaces in history. In fact up to now, I would say all peaces have been negative and none of them have lasted forever. Undoubtedly, if you had a constructive peace, a peace in which the various nations agreed not to refuse to do something, but agreed instead to do some positive program in common, and one can think of a lot of things that ought to be tackled by the nations working together in common, I say if you had a constructive peace of that sort it might very well be a good deal more enduring. But even a negative peace, as the example at the end of the Napoleonic War shows, can be a very enduring peace. It might be a peace that would be for our time and the time of our children, and of our children's children. If we really want to get some kind of peace that will wipe the curse of war from the brows of men, as long as we can foresee in the future, then I suggest that we can only do it by arriving at some kind of understanding that we won't do so unless we are firm, and that once we have achieved that we can perhaps all sit back and say that, well, possibly our fears at the end of World War II were just as unjustified as our hopes at the end of World War I. And undoubtedly we would be able to murmur that "Fully blessed indeed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

"U.N.R.R.A. IN POLAND"

An Address By

BRIGADIER CHARLES M. DRURY, D.S.O., M.B.E.

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, April 24, 1947

Major Clouse: We are honoured today in having as our guest speaker a distinguished soldier and one who is an authority on the rather complex Polish situation of today.

That unfortunate and harassed Republic—Poland—situated between two of the world's mightiest and most unpredictable powers and through the centuries acting as a buffer: invaded and carved up four times in a little over 150 years, and, in spite of the guarantees of the integrity of Polish territory proclaimed at Warsaw in November, 1918, and substantiated by the signatories of the Treaty of Peace in June, 1919—and again by France and Great Britain in March, 1939—again invaded from the West by the hordes of Hitler September 1, 1939, precipitating the last World War: 17 days later invaded from the East by the Russians and on September 21, 1939, declared jointly by Germany and Russia to have ceased to exist and forthwith carved up and divided again. It is interesting to recall, in the light of subsequent events, the irony of the pledge of the Soviet Union—following Germany's invasion of Russia in July, 1941—which pledge maintained the independence and freedom of Poland, the same as for all other countries occupied by means of force by Hitlerite Germany.

And today we find Poland awaiting the decision of the council of the United Nations as to what will constitute her new frontiers—and what is to become of her scattered population numbering nearly 35 million—and in the meantime virtually destitute and relying on U.N.R.R.A for sustenance.

Brig. Drury, following a distinguished military career, was appointed in 1945 Administration Officer of U.N.R.-

R.A. in Poland. He returned to Canada—and to the Dept. of External Affairs at Ottawa—last January, and he has graciously consented to address this meeting today on the subject:

"U.N.R.R.A. IN POLAND".

It is my pleasure to introduce Brig. Charles M. Drury, D.S.O., M.B.E.

Mr. Chairman, Members of The Empire Club: It is a very great privilege and honour for me to be asked to speak here this afternoon. I have not had many occasions, either to speak to large gatherings or to discourse publicly on the issue of Poland, and it is with some trepidation that I have looked forward to this ordeal.

As I say, I am very pleased to have been asked to come here, but I take exception, or slight exception to continuous reference to me as "Brigadier" Drury. During the war as a citizen soldier, I was accorded a certain rank, and I feel that possibly the use of that rank should cease with the end of the war. I have found on occasion that it has been a source of embarrassment to me and I will, if I may, illustrate that with one incident.

At a fairly large diplomatic reception in Warsaw, I was introduced to the Chief of the Polish General Staff, as General Drury. The Poles use the title because a Brigadier doesn't exist in their army, and they relate it to Brigadier-General, which is shortened to "General", upping the rank.

General Byhousky (?) was very polite and only raised his eyebrows, but after a few moments' conversation he went away and spoke to a colleague and I subsequently found he had asked his colleague whether he had heard right—he thought he had been introduced to General Drury, but it must be General Drury's son—could General Drury be produced for him?

Again today, without mentioning any names, when I came I was again greeted by a raising of the eyebrows. "This is surely not Brigadier Drury but one of his emissaries", and I feel the sooner that title is dropped, the better it will be for me.

By way of introduction I would like to say a few words about the unhappy condition in which Poland found herself at the end of the war. This background is perhaps necessary in view of the wide-spread misconceptions which appear to have been formed both on this continent and in the British Isles on the subject of Poland.

Of this misconception, perhaps the most striking evidence was provided within our mission, the U.N.R.R.A mission to Poland itself. In 1945 and even to quite late in 1946, we experienced the greatest difficulty in persuading recruits in the Anglo-Saxon world to come to Poland, to come to Warsaw, and work for U.N.R.R.A. The reasons given for not wanting to go were varied, and in most cases nebulous. They didn't relate to pay or to quarters, but generally dissatisfaction and unwillingness. But those whom we did succeed in persuading to come, were there for a very short time when they underwent a complete change of heart on the topic.

This was brought out most emphatically when U.N.R.R.A. began to be terminated, and we began to wind up and send home the personnel of the mission. It was then found that volunteers to go home were lacking. It was anticipated that there would be a rush to desert the sinking ship on the part of people eager to get back and to take up again a normal life and resume interrupted careers. But it came down virtually to a question of firing people. They didn't want to leave.

This sympathy and liking for the Poles is due entirely, I am afraid, to the hospitality and friendliness of the Polish people. This must be so, for life in Warsaw or in other Polish cities at the present moment offers few attractions but work. Amenities in the shape of theatres, movies, sports, whether organized or individual, are virtually non-existent. There is literally nothing to do but work, walk, and talk.

It is extremely difficult to convey a precise picture of what is going on in Poland. Some of it is very good and some of it is very bad. But a great deal is going on —action and a considerable degree of talk, but mostly action is the dominant note. The apathy and indecision which appear to characterize a number of other European countries which I have visited since the war, is, in Poland, completely absent.

Now in the Spring of 1945, Poland, as your Chairman has remarked, was virtually prostrate. However, of the pre-war population of some 35 million, about 6 million or the equivalent of one-half of the total population of Canada, had been killed or had died as a result of war operations. Of those left alive, about 6 million were outside of the country, either in the countries to the East, or the countries to the West.

Of her pre-war area of some 387,000 square kilometers, 181,000 or just under half, was incorporated into the Soviet Union, and the compensation in territory to be received from German hands, was then, and still is, not yet finally decided.

The Polish Government is claiming 104,000 square kilometers of German territory, but even if this were agreed in full, the total area of the country would be smaller than it was pre-war.

As a result of the invasion in 1939, the occupation from 1939 to 1944, and the subsequent operations to expel the Germans in 1944 and 1945, destruction on a greater or lesser scale has been visited on almost the entire country. It has been estimated that 38 per cent of the national assets of the country no longer exist.

The health of the people was in a shocking state. The German authorities pursuing a policy of reducing Poland to a serf state had ruthlessly and efficiently succeeded in eliminating the professional classes, including, of course, doctors and nurses, with a result that medical care had dropped far below what was required for the maintaining of a minimum reasonable health standard.

The denial of adequate food and clothing during the occupation, not only to those locked up in concentration camps, but to the population as a whole, had tremendously lowered resistance to disease, with the result that infection and debilitating diseases were extremely wide-spread.

It is difficult for you here to visualize in human terms the figures and statements which I have just given, and I would like to assume the case of a hypothetical Polish family, of a mother and father and ten children, and look at them in the spring and the early summer of 1945. Assuming that they have no more than their share of the national wealth, we would find that one-half of all the family land is no longer theirs.

But the father has high hopes of having his loss replaced by a different type of land on the other side of the farm. Not exactly the same land, but of a sort which would ultimately make his farm more modern and profitable.

Of the ten children, two would have been killed or died, since 1939; two more would be still abroad or in the process of returning to their home, following deportation for forced labour, or escape from the country at the beginning of the war, or during the Occupation. One has advanced tuberculosis, two not able to go to school in the winter because of lack of clothing.

Of the five horses only two are left. Of his six cows only two remain, and all his livestock is in poor condition and inefficient because of overwork and use as draught animals.

The clothes of the entire family are old, endlessly patched, and with few exceptions are confined to a single garment or a single costume to each individual.

The house in which this family of ten lives is about 40 per cent demolished and they are living two or three to a room, including the kitchen and living room.

But, perhaps, worst of all, everyone is hungry, not hungry for good, palatable nourishing food, but hungry for merely something to fill their stomachs—mere bulk—always and continuously hungry. There are few people, I think, on this continent who know what that feeling is. A diet of potatoes, turnips, water, and occasionally skim milk, does not produce a contented feeling.

The immediate prospects for this family do not look good. For even although they all could and did work and earn money, nothing was available or being manufactured on which money earned could be spent. But they did have tremendous confidence and optimism regarding the future. They were prepared to toil incredibly long hours to repair the devastation of war.

I would like to make it clear that this hypothetical family did not represent the worst case in Poland. There were many who were much worse off than that. On the other hand, there were those who were very much better off. But this family would represent the national average as applied to one single group.

This then was the Poland to whose assistance UNRRA came with some 485 million dollars worth of goods and services. This represents, this figure, about 4.2 per cent of the estimated $12,000,000,000 loss incurred as a result of the war, but one must remember that the purpose of the United Nations, through UNRRA, was not to make good in the devastated countries incurred, but only to provide sufficient fundamental and primary aid as would enable the devastated countries to start and be able to continue their own work of recovery.

Of the total dollars value of assistance, the greater part, or some $191,000,000 were spent on foodstuffs of all sorts. This food was not distributed directly by UNRRA but was handed over to the government and joined with indigenously produced food and made available to the public through the ration system, with the result that the entire scheme of food production, rationing and distribution, came under the scrutiny of the UNRRA Mission.

I may say that, given the conditions of destruction, and understandable disorganization which were then prevalent throughout the country, we were satisfied that the system was as good a one as could be devised in the circumstances.

There were lapses and cases of discrimination, but as soon as the attention of the government was directed to them, they were immediately set right. As a measure of the assistance in this field, and also the necessity for it, I would mention that in June 1946, June of last year, the non-rural population had a daily diet which totalled about 1,500 calories. Of this total about 1,100 calories were provided by UNRRA.

In this same month, some 70 per cent of the total consumed bread grain cereals, in effect, bread, were provided by UNRRA. Next to the provision of food to keep the people alive and able to work, the important thing was to raise the disastrously low level of food production so as to make the country at least self-sufficient, and if possible, to go further and raise the level even higher, so that Poland could resume her pre-war position of food exporter to some of the present day underfed countries of Europe. The drop in food production had been caused chiefly by war-induced migration of farmers, internal as well as external, the loss of one and a half million horses out of a total of three million and one-third of the total of three million cattle they had pre-war.

These livestock losses did result in a critical shortage of draught power as well as manpower, and UNRRA met or partially met this condition by providing about 200,000 horses to fill the most critical need, and more important, about 9,000 farm tractors which are equal to 16 to 20 horses each in work capacity.

Artificial fertilizer, a most necessary commodity, as any farmer knows, was also imported to tide over the gap until Polish fertilizer plants could be made to work.

Unfortunately, all of this arrived too late to have any effect on the 1946 crop, but the result will show at harvest time this year and it is hoped that sufficient production will be achieved to make the country self, supporting in respect to food from 1946 onward.

Unfortunately food production last fall was inadequate to meet requirements of the current year, and with UNRRA ending, the food situation, this spring in Poland, will again be serious.

In the industrial fields, needs were so vast and so varied that it was decided to confine the program to essential needs such as transportation and raw materials.

Before the war the main elements of the transportation system were the horse and railway, and the loss of 60 per cent of the horses, and the removal by Germany of the rolling stock of the railroads to replace losses incurred there by bombing, coupled with the German practice of stripping and destroying railway repair shops throughout the country, had left the Poles without the means to transport from producer to consumer what little food and goods there were.

To fill the gap UNRRA sent in about 17,000 trucks with a total load lift of 50,000 tons. Most of these were military vehicles obtained from Army surpluses. The majority were from Canadian Army services, with the Canadian pattern being most evident. These, of course, were rapidly wearing out and with the current impossibility of securing further supplies of spare parts, will slowly grind to a halt, probably at the end of the current year, even though it is planned to make use of demobilized vehicles as a reservoir of spare parts.

In the meantime, they will have served to tide over the period of the crisis until such time as the Poles can reorganize their own manufacture of motor vehicles and make arrangements for importation to meet their needs.

In the railway fields, emphasis was placed on the retooling of the railway repair shops. This was done in order that the number of semi-destroyed locomotives and railway wagons, which the Germans had not been able to remove because of their disabled condition, would be put back into running shape, and made to operate.

In early 1945 the Poles restarted with a repair capacity of about 10 to 20 per cent of pre-war.
Based on that, and with the assistance of the UNRRA program, they plan to turn out in 1947, some 200,000 locomotives and 13,000 railway vans in addition to simultaneously carrying out the capital repairs to war damaged stock.

Now the subjects I have mentioned are illustrative rather than exhaustive of the commodities which UNRRA brought into Poland. A catalogue of all of them would fill several volumes. By way of example, one of the smaller but important items was the provision of a complete set of instruments for neuro-surgery. This, while small, was extremely expensive and was done so that the five remaining neuro-surgeons in Poland would be able to restart their work which they were unable to do as none of them had succeeded in saving or salvaging their pre-war equipment.

In addition to the provision of food and other necessities of life, UNRRA also made available advisory services. In the agricultural, industrial, sociological, and medical spheres, in an attempt to bridge in some small measure the gap in knowledge, and the failure to continue to acquire knowledge in the five years of occupation—these services were highly valued and gratefully received by the Poles who took advantage of their limited equipment to learn and to apply the new ideas imparted.

In some instances, this work of instruction was a little frustrated. For example, a team of dentists were brought in from the United States. Each one of them was an expert in his particular line of dentistry, but they found that lectures on the uses of plastics for artificial dentures and new amalgams for fillings, tended, even when accompanied by demonstrations, to be a little theoretical because of the unavailability then, and for some time, of the plastics required, and the ingredients of the new amalgams.

But, they were all agreed that their mission of instruction was well worthwhile and gratifying in view of the almost pathetic welcome given to these lectures by the Poles who had been starved of technical knowledge throughout the war.

It is of course impossible for one to measure statistically the impact of UNRRA on Poland. One can compare the number of overcoats there were before and after UNRRA, the number of locomotives there were before and after, but equally important, I think, were the imponderables such as the indirect effect of UNRRA on employment, the output per man, and total employment.

I might also mention the spiritual satisfaction derived by the Poles from the knowledge that they were not being forgotten, now that the war had ended, by their war time Allies.

The Polish government has been successful in keeping inflation within moderate bounds, in the period of 1945 and 1946, and this is undoubtedly due in part, in any case, to the stability made possible through, and up to the present, the assured food supply, which not only enabled people to perform physical and mental labour, but also gave confidence that day to day work would lead to a better future.

As I said earlier, UNRRA importations were distributed by the Polish government through the ration system and all items, except those provided free to the indigents and very needy, were sold at pre-determined prices, and the proceeds of these sales were placed in a special account to be used for special relief and rehabilitation work on projects agreed between the UNRRA Mission and the government.

This policy of selling rather than giving away was effective in withdrawing from circulation at a critical or dangerous time a substantial amount of purchasing power which would otherwise have added to the serious and ever present inflationary pressure.

The UNRRA Mission itself, about which I may say a few words, was centered mainly in Warsaw, and numbered at its top strength about 170 imported personnel and about 200 Poles. The imported staff were in the main, English, American and Canadian, but included among our total numbers were Norwegians, Danes, a Belgian, Czecho-Slovaks, Australians, and Russians.

After a period of shaking down, the harmony which was achieved within the Mission was, I think, rather remarkable. Not only was there harmony in working, but an outstanding degree of willingness and ability to cooperate among the various nationalities.

English, of course, was the common language, and our correspondence, not only within the Mission, with London, and Washington, but also with the Polish government was conducted in the same language.

The structure of the organization would be divided into three groups. First, advisory personnel who were all highly qaulified in their own land, such as doctors of one sort and another, tractor specialists, sanitary engineers, dentists, feed experts, and so on.

Secondly, there was the administrative staff who looked after and provided the necessities of life and office facilities for the Mission. They were perhaps more numerous than many people thought necessary but in view of the disorganized state and the difficult living conditions that obtained in Warsaw, we found that they were all most necessary.

Finally, the third large group were the accounting staff, whose task it was to keep track of and make a tally of the shipments, item by item, made to Poland. At times there were as many as twenty ships in the two main ports of delivery unloading simultaneously, and it was an almost superhuman task to keep track of the entire stuff coming in and account for it satisfactorily, in view of the fact that there was a complete absence of ships' brokers, or customs brokers, in the reconstructed, or half-way reconstructed Poland. While the majority of the Mission lived in Warsaw, there were regional offices in six of the principal cities of Poland, and the task of the regional representatives was to make a local contact with the government administrative officials, and to check, from day to day, on the distribution and end use of such stuff as we brought in.

They were assisted by the advisory people in Warsaw, who made continuous trips throughout the country, to visit and supervise their activities. A number of trips made were limited by our vehicles, according to their ability to remain operating on the roads. They were bad. The gasoline we had was indifferent, and there was also a lack of spare parts, but we were in no way hampered by artificial controls. The letters, "UNRRA" on a car were the open sesame to travel throughout Poland.

There were occasions when vehicles were stopped by illegal bands, who were out for plunder, and in the case of many individuals who were so caught on the road, they were stripped of all they had, including sometimes clothing and their vehicles taken away from them, and forced to set out on foot for the nearest settlement. But, as I say, although occasionally our vehicles were stopped by these same lawless individuals, never was any of the UNRRA personnel molested nor the vehicles interfered with, with one exception. This occurred last fall when a truck carrying penicillin from Warsaw to Cracow was stopped half way there. After a certain amount of arguing by the driver—this was an UNRRA truck and so should be inviolate—the marauders removed the cargo and told the truck driver to go on his way.

However, before leaving he demanded and succeeded in getting from them a receipt and subsequentsy, in answer to a public appeal that was made, the entire load was returned intact about a week and a half later.

It was remarkable, even in the outlying areas, how widespread was the knowledge of the presence and operation in Poland of UNRRA. One would find that going into a small remote village and stopping to enquire the way, or for any other reason, your car would be surrounded by a number of eager, friendly people who were there not to ask for assistance, clothes, food or anything else, but merely for conversation, and in order to express their gratitude for what UNRRA was doing.

This occurred even in cases where they themselves had not received any direct benefit but where the feeling of gratitude existed for what UNRRA was doing for Poland as a whole.

Now the function of the Mission in Poland, as I mentioned earlier, was not to distribute the commodities brought in, the distribution was done by the government. It would have required a staff of four or five thousand people to do the work and we neither had the time nor could they have been found. The function of the Mission was to supervise and insist that distribution was carried out without discrimination as to race, religion, or political belief.

There has been a certain amount of discussion as to whether in fact such equitable distribution was achieved, and I myself and those who were with me in Poland are generally agreed at once, that the Polish government felt very strongly that their primary object was to achieve, at the earliest possible moment, the return to normalcy of the country, and to do this they were given the choice of two alternatives, in view of the continuous and overall shortage of the necessities of life: either they could spread misery or shortage evenly throughout every layer of population and when an intermittent shortage developed, let everyone go short, and consequently reduce the national output during this particular period, or, as a second alternative, they could insure that those who were most actively engaged in the reconstruction of the country were provided for in the way of food and clothing at any rate, as a first charge, and that those who either could not, by reason of incapacity, or would not, by reason of preference, contribute actively and continuously to the reconstruction of the country, that second category should be less preferred, and get along on their own.

Of the two alternatives, the government chose the second. It is a more hard-boiled alternative, but the one which will lead undoubtedly to an earlier return to normal conditions and one which will produce an earlier state of overall prosperity which will provide sufficient for all.

The result of this preference for given classes of people, was that the miners, railway people, port operators, among the industrial classes, were always or nearly always assured of a minimum amount of food, and in the period of greatest shortage, whereas those who were not doing the arduous labour that the heavy workers were, were deprived or denied this minimum standard of food, when serious shortages occurred.

This I think, is what has helped largely to lead to complaints that the discrimination has been on a political ground. In fact it was not on political, if any, but on economic ground.

It seems the one large exception to the general rule that heavy labour is preferred is the university students, and the children, who were always treated with the greatest solicitude as it was felt in them lay the future of the country.

In our task the greatest cooperation was received and a working relationship was achieved with the result that, as has been demonstrated in Poland, not only can an international organization be efficacious and productive of results, but also, given a certain mutual understanding, cooperate without any great amount of difficulty.

The Polish government appreciates this, realizes this, and I think it is demonstrated by their participation in such international specialized agencies as the European Central Inland Transport Organization, the International Civil Air Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, to mention a few, as well as UNO itself.

This, I hope, augurs well for the future of Poland, for Poland, like Canada, must rely for its future and security very heavily on international cooperation.

The purpose of UNRRA was to enable the people of Poland to help themselves, and the outstanding degree of success, which they have achieved to date, reflects the greatest credit on their courage, optimism, and industriousness, but it is safe to say that without the assistance of UNRRA no such recovery could have been achieved. The people of Canada, together with those of other contributing nations, may therefore take a large measure of credit for successfully putting into practice, for perhaps the first time, one of the great Christian precepts, that of the Brotherhood of Man, and this success is almost certain to show dividends in the form of mutual understanding and good will in the future.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ANNUAL MEETING

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, April 24, 1947.

Major Clouse: Gentlemen: Today we hold our annual meeting terminating the Club year 1946-47, according to our constitution. The report I am about to make will be rather abbreviated because a full financial report, duly audited, will appear in the year book.

I am pleased to say that we end this year with a surplus of about $800.00, generally comparable to last year.

(a) Not money making organization
(b) Liabilities—none
(c) Assets—nearly 1,500 loyal members (intangible)
  plus 80,000 air audience
  *1,500.00—bonds—furniture (tangible)

Our membership figure is slightly greater than last year. In 1903 when the Club was founded members 496, today nearly 1500. But we would like to add to this figure very substantially next year and welcome as members those gentlemen who subscribe to our principles and our motto—"Canada and a United Empire".

Life Membership—$50.00

During the year we lost eight members through death: Geo. Carruthers—D. O. Johnson—Dr. Samuel Johnston—C. H. Meredith—C. J. Musson—C. B. Shields—Dr. A. E. Stewart—and just a few days ago the most Rev. D. T. Owen—we mourn their passing but revere their memory and will long remember their loyalty to this Club.

During this year we have held 28 meetings and your Committee has endeavoured to secure as speakers outstanding persons and authorities on many interesting and diversified subjects. We hope that the results of our efforts have proven acceptable to you and to our audience of the air.

The Executive Council which you elected a year ago has proven most capable and very active . And I would like to pay a tribute to those worthy gentlemen who have assisted me so loyally in handling the administration of your Club during the past twelve months. Many members, I believe, do not fully realize the amount of work necessary and the sacrifices often made by members of your Executive to make possible the successful operation of your Club. And those efforts have been cheerfully forthcoming at all times from my co-workers of this year, for whom, I might add, I hold the highest regard individually as well as collectively.

I would like to express the thanks of the Club to the Officers of C.J.B.C for carrying the meeting each week to our large air audience, numbering between eighty and ninety thousand persons. These broadcasts are at *no* expense to the Club. And Mr. Reid Forsee of the C.J.B.C. staff who has acted as liason officer has our special thanks for his cheerful co-operation at all times.

I will now call upon the Chairman of the Nominating Committee—Col. J. E. Wilson, to make his report.

COLONEL J. E. WILSON: Gentlemen: Your nominating committee, consisting of five members of the Executive Committee and four other members approved at a regular meeting held at the Royal York Hotel on Thursday, March 27th, 1947, held two meetings and after due consideration, present the following slate:—

President—Mr. Tracy E. Lloyd.
1st Vice-President—Mr. Thomas H. Howse.
2nd Vice-President—Mr. George Hardy.
3rd Vice-President—Mr. Sydney Hermant.
Honorary Secretary—Mr. R. Ford Ralph.
Honorary Treasurer—
and Treasurer—Mr. W. W. Comber, C.A.
Honorary Auditor—Mr. H. T. Jamieson, C.A.

Executive Committee:
Col. F. F. Arnoldi, D.S.O.
Mr. H. C. Bourlier.

Mr. Chas. Byford.
Mr. J. A. Cole.
Mr. H. I. Colebrook.
Brig. Colin A. Campbell, D.S.O., O.B.E.
Mr. S. S. Fletcher.
Mr. Frank T. Gerow.
Mr. Horace Harpham.
Mr. Warren B. Hastings.
Mr. James H. Joyce.
Mr. G. A. Lascelles.
Sq./L. Norman A. Nunn.
Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.
Mr. T. A. Pugsley.
Major A. O. Thompson.
Col. J. E. Wilson.

Ex-officio members of the Executive Committee:

Immediate Past President:
Major F. L. Clouse.

Past Presidents:
Dr. Elias Clouse.
Mr. F. J. Coombs.
Mr. R. A. Stapells.

I move that this Report be accepted.

MAJOR CLOUSE: Gentlemen: You have heard the report of the nominating committee, which has been moved by Col. Wilson and seconded by Mr. R. D. Warwick, are there any further nominations? If not, I declare the nomiations closed and those whose names you have heard to be elected by acclamation.

At this time it is my pleasure to introduce your President elect, Mr. Tracy Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd served as Chairman of the Speakers' Committee during the past year and I feel confident in saying that his election to the

Presidency for the coming year, supported by the excellent Executive Council which you have elected, ensures a most successful 1947-48 season.

MR. TRACY LLOYD: Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen of the Empire Club: I greatly appreciate the honor you have bestowed on me in electing me as your President for the ensuing year.

I have also appreciated very much the opportunity of working throughout the past year with Mr. Clouse, and would like, on your behalf, to extend to him our hearty thanks for the able manner in which all the affairs of the Club have been carried on under his guidance.

With the co-operation of the Executive Committee, which you have just elected, I can assure you that I will do my utmost to carry on the traditions of the Empire Club and I feel strongly that if the founders felt it necessary in 1903 to organize this Club, it is just as important —if not more so—that it continues to flourish in these days.

"IDEALS OF MUSIC IN THE NEW WORLD"

AN ADDRESS BY

MR. JOHN ERSKINE

Chairman: The President, Major F. L. Clouse

Thursday, May 1, 1947

MAJOR CLOUSE: Mr. Prime Minister, Honored Guests, Members of the Empire Club of Canada and our listening audience: The Empire Club of Canada is privileged today to do honour to the Toronto Conservatory of Music during its Diamond Jubilee Celebration Week. For sixty years the Toronto Conservatory of Music has been the source and inspiration of much of the musical life of Canada and in its students the world of music has first been opened to the minds of children, men and women. Toronto is proud of the recognition received by both the men and women of the Faculty and the brilliant students of the Conservatory.

Frequently in the past the Toronto Conservatory of Music has assisted us in providing special programs, particularly at the Christmas season and we still remember with pleasure the Christmas message of Mr. Mazzoleni and the St. Mary Magdelene Choir conducted by Dr. Willan.

The Empire Club is indebted to Past-President W. E. Humphreys, who is also a member of the Board of Directors of the Toronto Conservatory of Music, for our program arrangements.

I now wish to introduce to you Glenn Gould, Artist Pupil of Alberto Guerrero, who was awarded the Toronto Conservatory of Music Gold Medal for the highest marks in Canada in the A.T.C.M. examination. He has also won several scholarships at both the Conservatory of Music and at the Kiwanis Festivals and has displayed unusual maturity in his interpretations of the works of the Great Masters—both on the piano and organ, studying the latter instrument with Frederick Silvestor.

Glen Gould will now play for your enjoyment a Chopin Waltz and Mendelsshons "Rondo Capriccioso".

And now, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is my happy privilege to introduce our Guest of Honor—Mr. John Erskine, Member of the Executive Committee of the Metropolitan Opera Association and Chairman of the Board of Directors of the famous Juilliard Musical Foundation of New York, of which he was President for nine years.

Our Guest of Honour is also an accomplished pianist, having studied with Carl Walter and Ernest Hutcheson and has appeared as guest artist with the New York Symphony Orchestra and the Orchestras of Chicago, Baltimore and other American Cities; also studying composition and orchestration with Edward MacDowell.

Our Guest was Professor of English at Columbia University for 21 years and is now Professor-Emeritus.

But, possibly, our guest of honour is better known to many as an author of international reputation and you will readily recall some of his books:- "The Enchanted Garden"; "Forget If You Can"; "The Private Life of Helen of Troy" and "Solomon My Son" and many others.

Mr. John Erskine will assist us in honouring the largest school of music in the British Empire and the subject of his address will be "IDEALS OF MUSIC IN THE NEW WORLD".

JOHN ERSKINE: Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, Honoured Guests and Members of the Empire Club of Canada: It is a special pleasure to offer my congratulations to the Toronto Conservatory on its 60th birthday. The Conservatory has just demonstrated its youthfulness, and its maturity, in the beautiful playing of Glen Gould.

I bring the warm good wishes of the Juilliard School of Music in New York. We have very pleasant ties with you. Edward Johnson, a long-valued friend and member of our Board is the Chairman of yours. In our day few men have done more for music education and for the promotion of good music in America, and few understand more clearly in what respect music education in the new world, in your country and in mine, must differ from traditional music teaching in the old.

I chose this subject because I know that your faculty are aware that the problem of the arts in this continent is somewhat different from anything the old world ever had to face. We must do better in the spread of the love and appreciation of good music than any country ever tried before. It is vital to us. It is vital to our influence in the world that is no corner of your land, and in no corner of mine, any talent should fail of a fair education and a fair chance.

I have in mind not merely the supreme geniuses. It is one of the pleasantest persuasions of democracy that even those of us who are not quite geniuses have our rights, and especially the right to education. In the old world it was considered enough to teach geniuses, and musical genius, as you know, was expected to occur only in the male sex. If it showed itself in a girl the family might encourage the caprice of nature, but with certain reservations. If your daughter had an irrepressible urge to walk the tight rope in the circus, you salvaged what you could by insisting that her public performances should be under an assumed name, preferably a foreign one. Likewise, if her urge was to perform on the piano, she could, of course, keep her own name, so long as she demonstrated the purity of her life by playing as only an amateur can. If she had a voice there was less hope for her, especially if the voice happened to be a good one. She might even become an opera singer, and her folks might fear to learn how she spent her time when she wasn't singing, especially if she took a name which prepared them for the worst.

I admit I am not being entirely just in this account of music in the old world. But I count on you to recognize the truth in what I have said, as well as the slight exaggeration.

There was a time when cultured Europeans believed that a serious and complete musical education should be almost exclusively the privilege of genius. It was in the new world, our world, that music first became recognized as a language, the most eloquent and subtle language ever employed by man to bridge the silence between soul and soul. The old world was accustomed to speak of music as the universal language, but in musical education the old world never acted on the logical implications of what it said. Genius is trained in vain to utter itself in a universal tongue, unless the audience is trained at the same time to listen. How can you communicate with me in any language unless I understand what you say?

During the First World War the American army accepted many boys from mountains and plains who could ride hard and shoot straight, but could not read or write. Compulsory and intensive study cured these cases of illiteracy in short order. I saw it done. At the end of the course the boys wrote their own diploma. Each sent a letter home to his mother or his wife—who presumably couldn't read. No doubt they prized the letters and wondered what they contained. When their men came home, perhaps they found out.

Are we training performers in exactly the same way, leaving the audiences temporarily unaided in their raw condition? They may be pleased to hear their children play or sing when we get through with them, but will they know what it is all about? Must they wait for the children, like the returning soldiers, to tell them what the letter contained?

Don't think I am about to plead for more of what is called music appreciation. We have scattered this unfortunate handicap to culture in most of the schools in the United States. Music appreciation of this kind trains boys and girls to have the right opinion about a piece of music, if they should hear it and should happen to recognize it.

We teach literature in the same way. It is a satisfaction, of course, to know that boys and girls, having enjoyed our instruction, will also remember that Ben

Jonson was a different person from Samuel Johnson, that they lived in different countries and didn't write exactly in the same way.

Of course, that saves us embarrassment at the dinner table among strangers. And perhaps it is a good thing for people who take courses in music appreciation to know when Brahms wrote and whether he came a little before Beethoven or a little after him. Maybe that is good. But I am getting too old to be patient with it. It isn't the real thing. It is cultural humbug. Unfortunately it is easy and comparatively cheap.

What I think we must undertake instead is difficult, but it's our opportunity. We teach our best children to perform. We try not to let any geniuses escape. But there are men and women in this world who are not geniuses in music, yet they have something to say, according to their ability, if the ability is trained and if all of us know the language of music. It can be learned like any other language, through use. There are exercises in reading and writing.

There may be no wonderful creations in literature in the elementary classes, and yet the children cannot write at all unless they can express their own ideas in some characteristic way, and read and understand the ideas of people more mature than they. ?

I am attempting to suggest a parallel between the teaching of our own tongue in the elementary schools, and in the high schools and universities, and the complete teaching of music as an art. If we know the grammar, if we know how to pronounce it and speak it, if we know how to express ourselves in it, and if we are accustomed to put our best hopes and thought in it, then our grasp of the language of music will be complete.

In the conflict of civilization we are facing other ideologies than our own. The influence of Russia in the arts has been prodigious, and it will be. Many Russians have still to learn to read and write their own language, but they have this larger language, it seems almost directly from nature, and in it they have spoken to the other countries of the world for a long time, and we have honoured them for their enormous talent in music, in literature, in the theatre, in the drama, the opera, and in the dance.

It won't do to say we are not interested in those subjects. The world is influenced by them, and the Russians are using their gifts now to influence the world. They are respected in South America and elsewhere, as I happen to know, not because South Americans naturally care for their economic system, but because in the realm of art they are overwhelming. They have the international language. And when we go down there, many of us can't even speak Spanish, which compared to music is a limited language.

I once asked Mr. Paderewski how he explained the musical gifts of his country, Poland, and of Russia. I said, "Has nature decreed that a child born in those countries should always excel in music?"

He answered, "Nonsense! Poland owes its music to the conservatories founded at the end of the 18th century, in time to bring together some great teachers, some of whom taught Chopin."

He added, "I think Russia owes practically everything in music to the Rubinstein brothers, Anton and Nicholas. Without great music schools," he went on, "I don't know how you can ever have a musical people. Man is the kind of animal that doesn't educate himself automatically. Somebody has to take him by the back of the neck."

In your country and mine we are quite ready to take ourselves by the back of the neck, and I came here today to say that it's time we did so.

We let some nice man, some generous-hearted lady go on our orchestra board or be a director of our symphony. It wouldn't hurt a bit if they knew a little more about music. Be we are risking much in the hands of people whom we have not yet adequately prepared. It is not their fault.

Our friend, Edward Johnson, gathers white hairs educating us from day to day, and week to week. That is how it has to be done, but it is not the right way. It is too much the way we educate Congressmen.

The next fifty years must be for you and for us a period of immense advance in the best and most thorough kind of education in art. At present we educate the talented, part of the time as performers and the rest of the time as audience. We insist that the performer shall know the idioms and the grammar of his language, and that he must listen to other performers. One day the youngsters are playing and the next day they are listening. If we had a large enough class listening, we could bring on the audience faster. But it wouldn't be enough to have them listen.

I say, whenever I speak to people who won't misunderstand me—I don't believe you will—that I should like to see the arts in my country reach the condition of baseball. I won't say football—I mean American football. In football we have cheer leaders. So few Americans have played football that they wouldn't be sure when to cheer if they didn't get the signal. In baseball we have no cheer leaders. The cheer leader couldn't leap to his feet fast enough to meet the audience. Every boy and man in the stands has played baseball, no matter how clumsily, and a great many of the girls. They never took a course in baseball appreciation.

If all of the audience, all of every audience, has tried to play the pieces they hear played, you know the delight is a thousandfold greater. They know the language, they know what is being said.

And that result isn't impossible. We have music in our public schools, but we must persuade all our schools, colleges and conservatories that the boys and girls who love music but don't care for it as a profession, or perhaps should not try to follow it as a profession, still have a duty as citizens to know the language and what is said in it by the new composers as well as the old.

Here comes a rather hard point. We don't know a language until we can talk in it and write in it. Our pupils should perform and listen—and also compose.

I heard a magnificent concert last night, as most of you did. We paid honour to lovely music expressed in another time than ours. It wasn't Canadian music. It was very good Canadian singing and wonderful Canadian playing. I am sure the day will come when your great Conservatory will occasionally stage a concert like that, with your orchestra, which is trained in your conservatory, and your singers, most of them trained in your conservatory, all performing the work of some of your pupils. This complete result must come for your country and mine, if we are to grow up.

Russia is right. Mr. Stalin is right in insisting that if their young people believe in what they are doing, they must be able to say it in music. They *are* saying it in music. It sounds to me like the devil, but they say it for all their people, who seem to understand that language. Don't laugh at them! They are ahead of us so long as they express themselves sincerely and understand what they are saying.

Where shall we turn for the great orchestral works which express your love of your country, or express the love of my people for our country? We haven't yet grown up on that side.

You may ask, "Haven't we music enough? Europe has been composing it for some time, and it is awfully good. Why shouldn't we leave well enough alone?"

There are profound reasons why we neither should nor can. Europe in various great creative moments expressed the soul of Europe. But Beethoven and Chopin never expressed the soul of Canada nor of the United States. They couldn't.

If we are to be confined to playing, year after year and for a hundred years and a thousand years, nothing but the immortal self-expressions of Europe, then we are dedicating ourselves to be nothing but phonograph records, and really not the best phonograph records at that. We have no career for our youngsters, no real career, unless there is something they need to say for themselves and for us.

There is another reason why we can't sit still. You know better than I that the most vocal minds of Europe in music just now don't admire their old masterpieces. They are telling the rest of the world that they are tired of the classics. They have loved them a long time, but their affection has died out. They want us to accept their synthetic inventions and experiments, produced at this moment of Europe's greatest fatigue.

I insist for myself—you can agree with me or not—that a good deal of this new music which young people from Europe say is a great improvement, largely because it is not at all like the older music—I insist for myself it is not a music that expresses the heart. I don't believe it expresses the real heart and soul of Europe today. At any rate, I am quite sure it doesn't express my heart, and I hope it doesn't express my soul.

We could survive these years of peace which are ahead, difficult years, perhaps—we never could have survived the war—if in the new world there hadn't been much to love and have faith in. Some of this will get into books. But is it going to be stated in music as Chopin once stated his love of Poland? You and I and most people who like the arts have learned more good things about Poland listening to Chopin's music than from all the books we ever read about that country. And what music can we play to the Russians now to explain to them why we love our country? We haven't such music yet. Let us hurry up and write it. Get going! We need it and we need it for our own souls.!

You know, as we grow older, we all discover that by trying to say what we really mean, as at desperate moments we are compelled to do, we learn more clearly what we do mean, and our reasons for saying it. With our back against the wall we sometimes are forced to see life clearly and make a very illuminating report of it.

All creative effort is just that. The composer clarifies our world for us. If we hear the music and feel that it speaks for us, we are likely to learn something about ourselves.

If we believe in our own way of life, we must be sure our ideals are expressed. We give considerable thought to re-educating Germany. I should be much more confident about that experiment if I were sure we knew where we might spread or enrich the idea of democracy at home. That in our wonderful countries there should be hundreds of thousands of men and women with a natural love of beauty, who are left in fundamental ignorance of the fine arts, is disturbing.

We expect the faculty of our music schools to know something about music. But the day will come when we shall expect the non-professional men and women who generously give their time to musical and other ventures, opera and philharmonic societies—we shall expect them also to know music. I suspect that all the philharmonic audiences you have ever met, if you asked them how the counductor gets an orchestra going at the beginning of the music, would admit they don't know. That is his language? Why his alone?

I am saying that we should train everybody to be a musician. I believe the number of talents in our hemisphere justifies the effort. If some of ur fear the effort is a mistake, if we see danger in training so many musicians, then we are slipping back into the European point of view. We are saying again that only a genius should have a chance, and we hope there won't be too many geniuses.

We forget something. In more primitive society in all parts of the world, men used to earn a living by writing letters for their neighbors. When schools in the new world began to teach everybody to read and write, the professional letter writers saw starvation staring them in the face. Nothing seemed more unfair to them than the destruction of their profession, yet somehow they did not starve. They found that their ability to spell and use a pen could be profitably employed in other ways than letter-writing.

I believe that when we are all educated in the universal language of music we shall find new ways to use that knowledge, ways which will not interfere with the profession of any one else.

The biggest asset we have in the new world is a new unweary point of view. The pioneers who came first were courageous and creative. It took courage to come out here and begin with the wilderness. Nowadays many more wish to come, but not because they are courageous. It takes courage now to stay at home in the old world. They are looking for rest and a haven, and we can't blame them.

I think we ought to let them all come over, but I'd like to keep out their mood of defeat and weariness. We have plenty of room—but only for the courageous.

Let me challenge you of the Conservatory to be more courageous than we. Lt's have a race. Will you at the Conservatory, or we at the Juilliard School, be the first to train our pupils to compose their own music, music to express Canada or the United States? When I come again, as I hope to, make me confess in your presence that you are further ahead than we are.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONTARIO

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1947

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1946				$1,909.44
RECEIPTS				
Membership Fees		$5,503.00		
Interest:				
On Investments	$ 60.00			
On Bank Balance	49.58			
		109.58		
			$5,612.58	
PAYMENTS				
Luncheon Expenses	$5,209.88			
Less:				
Proceeds of Sale of Tickets	4,725.42			
		$ 484.46		
Furniture and Fixtures		4.50		
Honoraria:				
Secretary	$ 550.00			
Treasurer	200.00			
		$ 750.00		
Miscellaneous Expenses		189.31		
Printing, Stationery and Postage		1,258.50		
Printing, 1945-46 Year Book	$1,722.56			
Less: Proceeds of Sale	155.00			
		$1,567.56		
Recording and Publicity		360.86		
Speakers' Fees and Expenses		267.80		
Telephone and Telegraph		203.61		
			$5,086.60	
Excess of Receipts over Payments				525.98
Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1947				$2,435.42

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1947, and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required, and that, in our opinion, the above statement shows correctly the Receipts and Payments of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1947.

In addition to the cash balance of $2,435.42, the Club holds $1,500.00 Dominion of Canada 3% Ninth Victory Loan Bonds due 1st September, 1966.

As at 30th April, 1947, the Club was committed to publish the 1946-47 Year Book at an estimated cost of $1,700.00.

H. T. Jamieson & Company,
Chartered Accountants,
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
10th July, 1947.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

*1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
*1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.
*1935-1940	Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

*1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason
*1905-06	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.
1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
*1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.
1909-10	Elias Clouse Esq., M.D.
*1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.R.S.
*1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
*1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
*1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig
*1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart
*1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Mus. Doc.
*1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.
*1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
*1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
*1921	Brig. Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
*1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
1924	William Brooks, Esq.
*1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C., V.D.
*1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928	Robert H. Fennell, Esq., K.C.
*1929	Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
*1930	John D. Spence, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq., K.C.
1932-33	Lt.-Col. The Hon. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Hon. Dana H. Porter, K.C.

* Deceased

1935-36	J. H. Brace, Esq.
1936-37	Major G. B. Balfour, B.A., K.C.
1937-38	Major R. M. Harcourt
1938-39	J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
1939-40	F. A. Gaby, Esq., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.
1940-41	The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, P.C. (Can.), K.C.
1941-42	C. R. Sanderson, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.
1942-43	John C. M. MacBeth, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1943-44	W. Eason Humphreys, Esq.
1944-45	Charles R. Conquergood.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Officers and Executive Committee

Year 1947-48

Officers:

President: TRACY E. LLOYD
First Vice-President: THOMAS H. HOWSE
Second Vice-President: GEORGE HARDY
Third Vice-President: SYDNEY HERMANT
Honorary Secretary: R. FORD RALPH
Secretary: JOHN HYDE BENNETT
Honorary-Treasurer and Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, C.A.

Executive Committee:

COL. F. F .ARNOLDI, D.S.O.
H. C. BOURLIER
CHARLES BYFORD
J. A. COLE
H. G. COLEBROOK
BRIG. COLIN A. CAMPBELL, D.S.O., O.B.E.
S. S. FLETCHER
FRANK T. GEROW
HORACE HARPHEM
WARREN B. HASTINGS
JAMES H. JOYCE
G. A. LASCELLES
SQ. L. NORMAN A. NUNN
J. P. PRATT, K.C.
T. A. PUGSLEY
MAJOR A. O. THOMPSON, M.C.
COL. J. E. WILSON, M.C.

Immediate Past President:

MAJOR F. L. CLOUSE

Past Presidents:

DR. ELIAS CLOUSE
F. J. COOMBS
R. A. STAPELLS

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members,
(f) Corporate or Sustaining Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f) must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meetitng of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article Active Resident and Associate members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and Non-Resident members $3.00, payable on or before the first day of October in each year. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of September in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Corporate or Sustaining Members

Art. 5A—Any company, partnership or business organization shall be eligible for election as a Corporate or Sustaining Member. Applicants shall be proposed by two Active Resident Members of the Club in good standing and the application shall contain the name and position of the Officer nominated by the Applicant as its Candidate for membership. The Applicant and its Nominee shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee. A Sustaining or Corporate Member shall pay an annual fee of $50.00 which shall include the fee of its representative member.

Officers to Be Elected

Art. 6—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-Presidents; an Honorary Treasurer, or a Treasurer, or both; an Honorary Secretary or a Secretary, or both; an Executive Committee which shall consist of the officers appointed under this Article and 17 other members, who, with the officers, shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. There may also be elected an Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer. Three Past Presidents together with the immediate Past President shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The Officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office until April 30th, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A Nominating Committee consisting of five members of the Executive Committee and four other members (this Committee shall select its own Chairman) shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and ap-

proved at a regular or special meeting of the Club not less than four and not more than six weeks before such Annual meeting, due notice of such regular or special meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such Committee shall report to the Annual Meeting. If nominations do not exceed the number of the officers and members of the Executive Committee necessary under the Constitution, the President shall instruct the Secretary to cast one ballot in favour of those so nominated and thereupon such persons shall be declared by the President to have been duly elected.

(3) An Auditor or Honorary Auditor shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:

(a) Budget and Finance Committee.
(b) Speakers' Committee.
(c) Membership Committee.
(d) Constitution Committee.
(e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(f) Publicity Committee.
(g) Year Book Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the Officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly, if possible, from October to April, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. An audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year shall be published in the Year Book.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special, and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Nine members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

MEMBERSHIP

as at April 30, 1946

LIFE MEMBERS

Bickell, J. P.
Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert
Clouse, Dr. Elias
Clouse, F. L.
Cobham, Arthur H.
Coombs, F. J.
Johnson, E. E.
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
Maher, James P.
Murdoch, Jas. Y., K.C., LL.D.
Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, H. G. K.C.
Stapells, R. A.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Tindall, H. B.
Wilson, Col. J. E.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Bourlier, H. C.
Geary, Major B. Handley, V.C.
Gillespie, Lt.-Col. George H.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Ahern, E. G.
Baker, Robert P.
Beaumont, Arthur
Bertram, Jas. B.
Black, H. H.
Boyd, Mossom de G.
Bradley, Bruce H.
Bradley, E.
Cawthra-Elliott, Maj. Gen. H. M.
Cranstoun, John A.
Crooks, H. D. C.
Crough, Dr. E. M.
Davidson, George MacK.
Davis, Aubrey
Dingle, Maj. Gordon R. M.
Duff, R. B.
Dutton, B. A.
Empringham, John R.
Fitzsimmons, R. H.
Flynn, Frank
Fraser, Alasdair D. R.
French, C. H.
Gilbert, C. A.
Hale, C. Harold
Hitchcock, C. H.
Hooper, Col. B. O., D.S.O., M.C.
Hudson, J. P.
Hughes, Gordon R.
Humphries, G. W.
Hutcheson, Frank W.
Innes, Rev. T. Christie, M.A.
Jackson, E. H.
Jackson, Geo. B.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kimpton, J. R.
Kreswick, D. A.
Leather, Harold H.
Lovell, E. A.
MacLennan, H. Alexander
MacRae, John
McCulley, Joseph
McIntosh, C. H.
McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
McLean, W. A.
Medland, C. R.
Moffat, John A.
Moffat, J. Mel.

Neill, Rev. John A.
Noyes, G. R. Finch
Over, Spencer Henry
Prince, Col. Alan C.
Raycroft, R. I.
Reid, J. K.
Rice, H. E.
Richardson, Dr. R. N. C.
Rollason, W. B.
Ryan, John
Sedgwick, A.
Shergold, Lt.-Col. C.
Sinclair, Duncan A.
Steele, C. E.
Thompson, J. R.
Wideman, Harvey
Wood, Chester F.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Chas. E.
Ackehurst, A. V.
Adair, Herbert E.
Adams, A. A.
Adams, G. W.
Adams, J. C.
Affleck, A.
Agar, Norman E.
Ahuja, M. R.
Aird, Major W. H.
Akins, W. George
Alberts, Edgar T.
Alexander, John B.
Alexander, R. W.
Alexander, Samuel
Allanson, Harry E.
Allen, Geo. H.
Allen, Thomas
Allnutt, Rev. F. B., D.TH.
Ambrose, J. R. W.
Ander, J.
Anderson, C. Harry
Anderson, E. H.
Anderson, George
Anderson, J. Murray
Anderson, W. L.
Andrecheck, E. J.
Andrews, S. J.
Andrews, T. E.
Angus, W. Harry
Appleton, C. N.
Archdekin, W. O.
Argo, J. A.
Armour, Rev. J. B. M., M.A., LL.D.
Armstrong, J. H.
Armstrong, W. J.
Arnold, Geo. A.
Arnoldi, Col. F. F., D.S.O. & BAR
Ashford, F. Allen
Askin, R. J.
Atkinson, F. L.
Auerbach, O.
Aylward, R. C.
Aziz, J.

Babayan, Levon
Babbitt, G. W.
Babcock, Harold A.
Bailey, Baldwin W.
Bain, George
Bain, H. R.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, Geo. A.
Baker, T. H.
Balfour, Gordon B., K.C.
Balfour, Keith C.
Ballard, B. W.
Band, Chas. S.
Barber, Geo.
Barber, William
Barbour, Royden M.
Bark, W. A.
Barrett, Brian N.
Barry, Harry C.
Bartholomew, F. W. E.
Bartley, Geo. E.
Bartman, G. M.
Bate, Wm. B.
Bates, Rev. F. W.
Bates, Wm. D.
Batten, Reg. A.

Baxter, Major W. James
Baylis, A. J.
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beardmore, S. H.
Beardsworth, H.
Beare, W. B.
Beatty, C. W.
Beatty, Dr. Hy. A., M.R.C.S.
Beatty, W.
Beaumont, H. F.
Bedford, Harold F.
Bedford, Morley S.
Bedolfe, Robert D.
Beeston, Geo. H.
Begley, Geo. E.
Bell, Lt.-Col. Arthur A.
Bell, Dr. W. J.
Belyea, A. E.
Bennett, A. B.
Bennett, E. J.
Bennett, Lieut-Col. J. H.
Bennett, Major James W.
Bennett, Norman D.
Bennett, Lt.-Col. Peter W.
Benson, D. F.
Berkinshaw, N. W.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Berry, N. T.
Best, Douglas W.
Best, Gordon H.
Best, T. Harrison
Best, T. W.
Betts, D. Clive
Bevan, G. H.
Bickle, E. W.
Bingham, Rev. Dr. H. H.
Binnington, H. J.
Birkenshaw, J. H.
Bishop, Colonel A. L.
Bishop, G.
Bishop, H. H.
Blackwell, B. S.
Blackwell, H. W.
Blackwell, Hon. Leslie E.
Blanchet, Reginald J.
Bland, Rev. Salem G.
Boag, Ernest C.
Boase, J. B.
Boehm, A. Fred
Bogart, Ernest C., K.C.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bomby, W. S.
Bond, E. A.
Bone, Fred A.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Booth, E. H.
Booth, Jake M.
Boustred, R. Warren
Bowers, E. J.
Bowman, Capt. Tom E.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Boylen, J. C.
Boyter, J. B.
Brathwaite, F. Y. W.
Britnell, Robert G.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brockwell, Meredith R.
Brooke, Arthur T.
Brookes, Air Vice Marshal G.E.
Brooks, Chas. C.
Brooks, W.
Brown, D. Leslie
Brown, F. I.
Brown, Gerald M.
Brown, James N. M.
Brown, Murray
Brown, Ross S.
Brown, Stuart H.
Brown, W. E.
Brown, President W. T.
Browne, R. J.
Brownlee, Rev. E. A.
Bryce, Very Rev. Peter, D.D.
Bryce, Robt. A.
Bryson, R. N.
Bull, W. Perkins, K.C., LL.D.
Burgess, John H.
Burke, E. T. C.
Burn, Grant M.
Burnett, E. R.
Burns, H. D.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.
Bush, Clayton E.

Bushnell, Wm. J.
Butt, Dr. W. H.
Byford, Charles
Byrne, A. T.

Caffrey, W. J.
Calder, B. R.
Calvin, C. C.
Cameron, A. J.
Cameron, Harry
Campbell, Brig. Colin A.
Campbell, Dr. Colin A.
Campbell Dr. D. M.
Campbell, E. M.
Cane, A. W.
Capell, S. L.
Carl, Gordon A.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carnegie, F. T.
Carnegie, N. F.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carriere S. W.
Carroll, Frank J.
Carruthers, Geo. L.
Carscallen, H. M.
Carson, C. E.
Carson, James L.
Carter, F. H.
Carthy, Dr. W. C.
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Case, Everett J.
Cassidy, Frank C.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caulder, J. A.
Caven, Dr. W. R.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chappell, H. L.
Charles, Leo E.
Chester, Lane R.
Chipman, Lt.-Col. J. H.
Chisholm, Lt.-Col. Geo. T.
Clark, C. T.
Clark, John G.
Clark, Dr. Stanley K.
Clark, Dr. Wm. J.
Clarke, E. E.
Clarke, W. H.
Clarkson, G. T.
Cliff, Geo. J.
Cockburn, Blake A.
Cockell, J. Horace
Cody, Hon. and Rev. H.J., C.M.G.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Cole, Joseph A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Coles, Gordon E.
Coles, Kenneth
Collie, W. H.
Collington, George E.
Comber, W. W.
Complin, Gordon
Conant, Hon. Gordon D., K.C.
Connolly, C. P.
Conquergood, Chas. R.
Conquergood, J. N.
Coon, H. J.
Cooper, W. P.
Cork, J. Milton
Corlett, W. E.
Cornish, Prof. Geo. A.
Corrigan, Dr. C. A.
Corrigan, Fred S.
Corson, R. R.
Cosgrave, Rev. Dr. F. H.
Coste, E. F.
Cotterell, E. D.
Cottrell, John W.
Cottrelle, Geo. R.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, Rev. Dr. J. J.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Courtice, A. Roy
Coutts, Wm. E.
Coverdale, Thomas
Cowan, F. W.
Cowan, P. J.
Coyle, J. P.
Coyne, Gordon
Cozzi, A. J.
Craft, George B.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, Clande C.
Craig Lt.-Col. John A. D.
Craig, Dr. M. L.
Craig, T. A.

Crang, J. H.
Crawford, F. J.
Crawford, N. R.
Crawford-Brown, Lyman
Creighton, Arthur H.
Crighton, A. S.
Crockett, E.
Cross, Wm. B.
Crossin, H. W.
Crossingham, J. H.
Crothers, J. F.
Crummey, Dr. Clarence B.
Cudworth, W. O.

Daley, A. W.
Daly R. A.
Daly, Roland O.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davidson, D. L.
Davies, H. E.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis C. B.
Davis, George A.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Day, W. D.
Deacoff, G. A.
Deacon, Col. F. H.
Decker, Chester J.
Demcoe J. W.
Dennehy, Henry M.
Dent, C. R.
Dentay, E. G.
Despard, W. H.
Detweiler, W. O.
de Veber, L. S.
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, Prof. N. W.
Dickey, A. J.
Dicks, A. W. F.
Dilworth, W. A.
Diven, Robert E.
Dix, Wm. B.
Dixon, J. N. S.
Doherty, A. W.
Doleman, A. J.
Dolson, Dr. Wilbur J. M.
Donaldson, John
Doran, F. C.
Douglas, Howard R.
Down, A.
Draimin, Charles
Dray Lt.-Col. W. J.
Drew, Lt.-Col. The Hon. G. A.
Duckworth, Lloyd
Duffett, Norman G.
Duncan, Jas. S.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunham, Lt.-Col. F. H.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlap, D. M.
Dunn, Norman M.
Dunn, William
Durance, John J.
Durland, D. C.
Dutton, Thomas M.

Easton, J.
Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eby, H. D.
Edmonds, C. E.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Elcombe, S.
Elgie, G. C.
Elliot, B. V.
Elliott, Charles R.
Elliott, G. N.
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elmsley, Maj.-Gen. J. H.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, Edward H.
England, Charles
Enman, H. L.
Entwistle, John S.
Epstein, Morris H.
Everett, Curtis T.
Ewart, Fred
Ewing, Thos. H.
Ezrin, Maurice

Faber, George
Faber, R. W.

Fairs, C. G.
Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Fennell, Robert H.
Fensorn, Howard E.
Fenwick, Gordon
Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, M.
Ferguson Thomas
Ferrier, L. B.
Fessenden, C. V.
Field, R. W. A.
Findlay, Major D. M.
Finlay, Fred J.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fisher, D. B.
Fisher, Frank
Fisher, H. R.
Fishman, Philip
Fleming, Donald M., M.P.
Fleming, Major Robert
Fletcher, S. S.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, Wm. J.
Fox, E. D.
Frame, S. J.
Frankel, Roy H.
Frankling, T. H.
Fraser, John A.
Frazer, A. W.
Freer, A. B.
French, George, M.D.
Freyseng, Willis P.
Friedgut, Major A. H., K.C.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.
Fyfe, J. Allan
Fyvie, J. M.

Gaby, Dr. Fred A.
Gadway, Bruce
Gairdner, J. A.
Gale, George C.
Gale George T.
Gale, R. H.
Gallanough, Dr. F. J.
Gamble, Frank W.
Garber, Frank
Gardiner, F. G.
Gardiner, H. H.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Garfunkel, Capt. B. H.
Garrett, Albert H.
Gaunt, J. Wm.
Gaviller, Charles
Geggie, Thomas P.
Genovese, Frank A.
Gerow, Frank T.
Gianelli, Brig. Norman A.
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibbens, W. M.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, Wm. S.
Gilbride, W. P.
Gilchrist, Dr. A. J.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gillard, Harry R.
Gillespie, Dugald L.
Gillespie, James
Gillespie, Wm.
Gillett, L. G.
Gilmour, A. H.
Glennie, Geo. H.
Gohn, Byron E.
Goldberg, A. M. P.
Goldring, Dr. C. C.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, M. Ross, K.C.
Gooding, T. W.
Goodman Edwin A.
Gordon, A. B.
Gordon, H. G.
Gordon, Wm. E.
Gorrie, J. A.
Gould, J. Lyall S.
Gowdy, D. M.
Graham, D. M.
Graham, Kingsley, K.C.
Graham, J. Lindsay
Grainger, Horace A.
Grainger, R. N.
Grand, Percy F.
Grant, J. R.
Grant, J. W.
Grant, W. G. F.

Grattan, William R. B.
Gravely, J. F.
Gray, G. A.
Green, Brig. Ernest H., S.A.
Green, J. D.
Greene, L. R.
Greene, R. L.
Gregory, R. A.
Grellet, Jacques
Grier, A. Monro, K.C.
Griffin, J. W.
Griffith, W. L.
Griffiths, F. D.
Grimbly, Maurice
Grisdale, C. L.
Guest, A. E.
Guest, Wm. C.
Gully, Harold M.
Gundy, C. L.
Gundy, J. H.
Gunn, Major General John A.

Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hall, Howard A.
Hall, I. C.
Hallarn, W. J.
Halliday, Roy
Ham, C. N.
Ham, E. F.
Hambly, Herbert
Hambourg, Boris
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamilton, John
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanna, Wm. B.
Hansen, Harald N.
Harbinson, V. D.
Harcourt, Major R. M.
Hardy, George
Hardy, H. R.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harkness, G. F.
Harkness, Lt.-Col. R. B.
Harman, H. M.
Harpham, Cecil
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Goodwin R.
Harris, Jos. H.
Harrison, James E.
Harrison, James F.
Harrison, Kenneth J.
Harrison, W. E.
Harron, Hal S.
Harton, E. Douglas
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.
Hatch, Carr
Hatton, Ed.
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, V. S. G.
Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hayden, Hon. Salter A.
Hayes, Barry B.
Haynes, Fred G.
Haynes, H. G.
Hayward, A. P.
Hazell, R. T.
Heagerty, Leo J.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Hemmerick, George
Henderson, Robert
Hendrie, George C.
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Herbinson, Wm.
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Hermant, Sydney
Herod, Wesley J.
Hewson, E. G.
Higgins, Fred Page
Higgins, W. A.
Highley, C. N.
Hilborn, Melvin
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, John D.
Hill, Dr. Lawrence R.
Hill, Roy C.
Hillmer, R. W.
Hillock, James
Hoadley, Hon. Geo.
Hoblitzell, Fred G.
Hodgins, Albert
Hogarth, D. M.
Hogg, N. D., M.B.E.

Hogg, Dr. T. H.
Hollinrake, Col. O. S.
Holliss, J. F.
Holliss, Dr. Karl E.
Holmested, G. S.
Holtzman, M. E.
Honey, Dr. E. M.
Hooker, Edwin R. K.
Hookway, C. W.
Hopkins, Dr. H. E.
Hopkins, Howard
Hopkins, Oliver B.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Horne, J. V.
Horsfall, H. H.
Hotrum, Fredk.
Houghton, E. O.
Houghton, W. R.
Houston, H. T.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howe, H. J.
Howse, Thos. H.
Huckvale, Robert
Huffman, Geo. E.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hulbig, F. M.
Hull, Rodney
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphreys, W. Eason
Humphries, W. R. B.
Hunt, A. T.
Hunt, John F.
Hunt, Capt. W.
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, E. J.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hunter, H. T.
Hunter, K. M.
Hurlbut, C. A.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, J. D. H.
Hutchison, O. A.

Innes, Captain W. C. C.
Inglis, M. Osborne

Jackman, H. R.
Jackson, C.
Jackson, Chas. W.
Jackson, L. G.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
Jamieson, H. T.
Jamieson, John D.
Janes, Gordon
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jenney, H. B.
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald
Jerry, Carman A.
Johnston, Alton V.
Johnston, Lt.-Col. Baptist
Johnston, E. Graham
Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, G. F.
Johnston, R. C.
Johnston, Wm. R.
Jolliffe, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Jones, Frank
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, Gordon
Jones, Gordon
Jones, J. Erle
Jones, Sir Vincent S.
Jones, W. D.
Joyce, James H.
Junkin, Col. Lawrence

Kaplan, S. C.
Kasman, Philip
Kay, Edwin
Keefler, Lt.-Col. J. K.
Keely, Geo. M.
Kellam, Geo. M.
Kelley, Hon. Russell T.
Kellow, Ralph S.
Kelly, M. J.
Kelson, Harry L.
Kennedy, George H.
Kerr, A. B.
Kerr, Halbert J.
Kerr, John E.
Kerr, P. Gordon J.
Kerr, W. R.
Keys, Norman A.
Kilgour, R. C.

King, Arthur C.
Kinghorn, A. A.
Kinnear, T. Clark
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirk, A. M.
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kirkpatrick, W. R.
Kirkwood, A. L. C.
Kitchen, Dr. Irving D.
Kline, Joseph

LaBine, Chas.
LaBine, Gilbert
La Ferle, Charles
Laing, G. Blair
Lamb, Col. H. J.
Lamb, Rev. Canon P. M.
Lambert, George
Lang, James
Langlois, M. G.
Lapp, Dr. John S.
Larry, Leo J.
Lascelles, G. A.
Laughton, H. V., K.C.
Lavine, Arthur
Lawer, W. L.
Lawrie, Donald L.
Lawson, Frank G.
Leacock, Geo. D.
Leary, Al
Ledger, W. R.
Lee, Harry S.
Leibel, Dr. Bernard
Leibel, Wm.
Leitch, G. C.
Lemon, W. E.
Lennie, E. D.
Lesce, Dr. S. J.
Levenston, Lt.-Col. G. F.
Levey, L. E.
Levy, Mark
Levy, Mort. L.
Lewis, E. S.
Lewis, Robert
Lindsay, G. C.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linton, Hall
Lister, M. Parker
Lithgow, J. H.
Litteljohn, A. M.
Little, F. M.
Little, Wm.
Livingston J. A.
Lloyd, T. E.
Logan, S. H.
Logie, Ben
Logie, Ernest R.
Long, Clinton E.
Lord, R. W.
Lougheed, W. J.
Lount, H. M.
Love, Harry H.
Lovering, His Honor Judge Egerton
Lumbers, G. C.
Lundberg, Hans
Lyon, Alex J.
Lyons, Lt.-Col. J. E.

Mabee, O. B.
Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C. M., K.C.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
MacDiarmid, H.
Macdiarmid, W. J. G.
MacDonald, Arthur A.
Macdonald, Charleton E.
MacDonald, Dr. H. S.
MacDonald, J. K.
Macdonald, Neil
Macdonnell, H. W.
MacDuffee, James
MacEachern, Gordon A.
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacInnes, Col. C. S., K.C.
MacKay, Hon. Mr. Justice J. Keiller
MacKelcan, Fred R.
Mackellar, S. R.
Mackey, Wallace A.
MacKinnon, J. Bruce
Maclachlan, Wills
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Commander A. D. R.C.N.V.R.
MacLean, Major Hugh C.
MacLean, Lt.-Col. J. B.

MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
MacMillan, William
MacNaughton, J. D. K
MacNicol, John R., M.P.
Macphee, Norman
Macpherson, Alex F.
Macrae, E. M.
MacRae, F. J.
Mactaggart, Rev. Dr. W. A.
Madsen, J. C. K.
Magi, M. I.
Male, W. Harold
Mallison, Fred
Mancantelli, Robert
Manning, H. B.
Marchment, W. R.
Markon, K.
Marks, Wilton
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marshall, Geo. A.
Marshall, G. Reg.
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Martin, H. J.
Martin, Magistrate O. M.
Martin, S. O.
Martin, Stacey V.
Martin, William
Masse, O.
Massey, Denton, M.P.
Massie, R. H. L.
Matthews, Hon. Albert
Matthews, C. F.
Matthews, C. Syd.
Matthews, F. Beverley, K.C.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, James R.
Matthews, Paul W.
Matthews, Hon. R. C.
Matthews, T. Frank
Maunsell, J. Q.
Maxwell, Frank D.
May, George E. I.
Maynard, Robt. B.
McArthur, Major Alex A.
McArthur, Lt.-Col. A. S.
McAteer, W. B.
McAvoy, Louis Peter
McBain, Alex.
McBain, Brig. Robert, S.A.
McCaffrey, E. R.
McCarthy, John
McCarthy, Leigh M.
McCarthy, Hon. Leighton
McCartney, Wm. S.
McClatchie, John
McClelland, D. McK.
McCloskey, H. C.
McCloskey, L. C.
McColl, Hugh
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Chas.
McCrea, J. G.
McCrea, T. Arthur
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCullagh, C. G.
McDougall, R. G. M.
McDowell, George
McGaw, A. F.
McGillivray, Dr. Donald
McGillivray, T. A.
McGinnis, S. L.
McGowan, James R.
McGowan, L. J.
McHardy, R. A.
McIntosh, A. N.
McIntosh, J. McD.
McKay, Wm. G.
McKee, John W.
McKenzie, C.
McKerracher, Dr. D. G.
McKerrow, J. O.
McKinley, Dr. J. N.
McKinnon, W. L.
McLaren, J. B.
McLean, J. S.
McLeod, W. N.
McMahon, S.
McMillen, John B.
McMurray, Leonard L.
McNamara, George A.
McNeil, W. G.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, Geo. G.
McPherson, R. S.
McSporran, Malcolm
McTavish, C. E.
McVey, Roy A.
McWilliams, D. B.

Medhurst, C. E. H.
Medland, J. A.
Medland, T. J.
Meech, R. G., K.C.
Mellish, A. E.
Menzies, Harold
Menzies, Thomas E.
Meredith, Arthur
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Mess, Brigadier James
Mickelsen, C.
Middleton, A. N.
Might, P. G.
Miles, Arthur W.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, Chas. T.
Miller, P. C.
Miller, T. D.
Milliken, Walter T.
Milling, Ernest R.
Mills, J. D.
Mingay Col. J. Donald
Mist, Charles F.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, A. R.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Charles
Mitchell, D. V.
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, Wm. G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, D. R.
Moffat, John H.
Moncur, W. L.
Montgomery, Dr. Robert C.
Monypenny, T. F.
Moore, C. Frank
Moore, F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
Moore, S. J.
More, W. G.
Morgan, Basil
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morgan, William S.
Morley, Frank
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morris, G. F.
Morrison, Lt.-Col. L. S.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, G. A.
Mortimer, J. A.
Moss, Glenholme F.
Mudie, Hubert C. P.
Muir, Wm. G.
Muirhead, W. T.
Mulock, Col. The Hon. W. P.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Munn, Chas. H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Murdoch, W. E.
Murphy, A. P.
Murphy, Thos. A.
Murray, D. Bruce
Murray, Major Gladstone
Murray, H. W.
Murray, R. F.
Muskett, H. W.
Mutch, C. M.
Myers, Rev. A. J. Wm.
Mylrea, A. J.

Nash, Gerald
Needham, C. F.
Neelands, E. V.
Neil, W. S.
Neilly, Balmer
New, Ryland H.
Newbegin, L. R.
Newby, Rev. M. T.
Newell, John O.
Newman, Harry A.
Newman, T. C.
Newport, W. R.
Newth, Reg. W.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, James
Nicol, John P.
Nicol, W. E.
Noble C. Stanley
Noble, Wilfred G.
Nock, Harry
Nodwell, Clifford F.
Norman, Cecil
Norman, Harold F.
Norman, Sidney

Northey, R. K.
Northway, A. G.
Nunn, Herbert G.
Nunn, Norman A.

Oakley, Thomas
O'Brien, G. E.
O'Connor, W. M.
Oglesby, W. V.
Oldfield, Harold G.
Olver, Lt.-Col. E. A., D.S.O., V.D.
Omand, J. N
Omejer, Capt. Odegard
Ongley, David J.
Opie, R. P.
Osborne, D. Hillis
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osbourn, A. J.
Osler, Glyn
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, G. H.
Owens, C. L.

Page, Wm. A.
Paillefer, H. C.
Pakes, S. A.
Palmer, H. A.
Parish, M. C.
Park, Hugh
Parker, Dr. Chas. B.
Parker, Very Rev. Stuart C., D.D.
Parkinson, N. F.
Parks, Capt. Arthur H.
Parsons, Robert C.
Parsons, Robert S., Jr.
Partridge, A. G.
Paterson, A. S.
Paterson, J.
Patrick, W. G.
Patten, Edward
Patterson, J. K.
Patterson, R. E.
Pattison, Dr. C. L.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, R. John
Pearson, Gerald F.
Peckover, Cecil R.
Pennington, Roy O.
Pepall, Geo. T.
Pepler, Lt.-Col. H. W. E.
Perry, D. A.
Perry, Geo. D.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, H. M.
Perry, John Wm.
Perry, N. R.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Philp, H. D.
Phimister, Z. S.
Phoenix, C. S.
Pickup, J. D.
Pickup, J. W., K.C.
Pike, Harry A.
Pike, Theodore
Plantner, J. F.
Playfair, S. B.
Playter, W. P.
Pooler, E. H.
Porter, Hon. D. H.
Porter, Dr. Geo. D.
Poucher, F. B.
Powley, J.
Pratt, Dr. D. W.
Pratt, J. P. K.C.
Prentice, Magistrate John L.
Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Vincent, K.C.
Price, Lieut.-Col. W. H.
Priestman, R. B.
Pringle, J. F.
Proverbs, C. I.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey
Pullan, Harry
Pullen, Frank
Purcell, Gillis
Purkis, Thornton

Rae, Robert
Ralph, R. Ford
Ramsay, Victor R.
Randall, S. J.
Rankin, Donald O., B.A.
Ransom, A. C.
Rapson, William
Rawlinson, Lt.-Col. Walter
Rea, Charles E.

Reddrop, F. O.
Reed, Col. Le Grand
Rees, S. L.
Reeve, Fred J.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Harry E.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Dr. Spence
Reilly, Leonard M.
Rennie, Thos.
Reynolds, S. B.
Richardson, G. W.
Riddell, Frank A.
Ridout, G. Lawton
Riley, E. D.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Ripley, Col. Blair
Ripley, Bruce T.
Ritchie, John
Robb, Charles W.
Robbins, W. D.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Roberts, H. A. D.
Robertson, Major Chas. A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. G.
Robinette, George W.
Robinson, G. G.
Robinson, W. E.
Robinson, W. G. W.
Robinson, W. J.
Robinson, W. W.
Robson, F. E.
Roewade, O.
Rogers, Alfred
Rogers, H. A.
Rogers, H. L.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Rooney, J. H.
Ross, Alexander P.
Ross, Douglas G.
Ross, J. A.
Ross, Dr. John F.
Ross, Hon. W. D.
Rotenberg, Harry I.
Routley, Dr. F. W.
Rowe, Arthur L.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Roxborough, E. L.
Ruddy, E. L.
Russell-Murray, J.
Rutherford, W. S.
Rutley, H. A.

Sachs, W. R.
St. Lawrence, F.
Salter, W. R.
Sampson, S. F. D.
Samuel, Sigmund, LL.D.
Sanders, C. J.
Sanders, Wilfrid
Sanderson, C. R.
Sandwell, B. K.
Sandy, J.
Sargeant, E. S.
Sarjeant, Dr. P. A.
Saunders, Mayor Robert H.
Saunders, Sydney B.
Savage, R. W.
Sawers, Ven. Archdeacon, F. J.
Scherer, Joseph
Scheuer, Edmund Jr.
Scheuer, Isadore S.
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, John R.
Scott, S. C.
Scott, W. S.
Scruton, J. F.
Seagram, J. W.
Seale, Leslie H.
Seccombe, W. Wallace
Sedgwick, Harry
Sedgwick, Joseph
Seeley, Rev. R. S. K., D.D.
Selby, W. T. H.
Sellers, W. F. C.
Semmons, Frank F.
Sewell, Ralph E.
Shakespeare, Wm. C.
Sharpe, Charles T.
Sharpe, Edward R.
Shaver, Edward B. H.

Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Sheppard, G. H.
Sherbut, James
Sherk, Frank T.
Shevlen, W. A.
Shiach, Harold A.
Shiels, M. S.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Sibbald, S. J.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Simpson, James I.
Sims, R. L.
Sinclair, Gordon
Sinclair, Leslie L.
Singer, J. G.
Slater, Leslie Geo.
Slatkin, Alfred D.
Sloan, W. G.
Small, S. A.
Smallacombe, Wm. J.
Smallpeice, V. N.
Smith, A. Bayard
Smith, A. L.
Smith, F. D. L.
Smith, Major G. C.
Smith, Gordon
Smith, Gordon Ewen
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Harry R.
Smith, Irving D.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, S. E. V.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, Dr. Sidney
Smith, S. Titchener
Smith, W. C.
Smuck, Frank
Snider, C. H. J.
Snively, Major A. C.
Snowdon, C. Allen
Soltermann, Jules R.
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Sparling, E. M.
Spence, Dr. R. J.
Spence, Dr. W. A.
Spooner, C. H.
Spooner, Lt.-Col. R. T.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Sproule, M. L.
Staal, A.
Stainton, Rev. Harold
Stalker, N. O.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stapells, Arthur A.
Steiner, E. A.
Stephenson, H. R.
Sterne, Harry C.
Stevens, V. S.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, C. H. E.
Stewart, D. E.
Stewart, Dunlop
Stewart, J. Cecil
Stewart, Wm. J., O.B.E.
Stickney, M. R.
Stodart, A. B.
Stoddart, George W.
Stoddart, W. H.
Stoneham, G/C. D. W.
Stoneman, Harry P.
Storey, Gilbert C.
Strong, Gerald
Stutz, B. J.
Summers, G. F.
Sutherland, Harry L.
Sutton, Thomas A.
Suydam, J. C.
Symons, H. L.

Taylor, C. W.
Taylor, Donald
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, J. R. K.
Taylor, John E.
Taylor, Reginald W.
Tedman, Harry M.
Therrien, James A.
Thomas, H. O.
Thomas, R. H.
Thompson, Alexander G.
Thompson, Arthur C.
Thompson, Major A. O.
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Fred G.
Thompson, Geo. W.
Thompson, Gordon V.

Thompson, Harry T.
Thompson, J. W.
Thompson, Murray O.
Thompson, P. Delos
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tilston, Charles E.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Tory, John A.
Townsend, J. C.
Tredway, Wm. G.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tudhope, H. R.
Tupper, Charles
Turner, Cdr. A. Charles
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James
Turville, Frank D.
Tuteur, Capt. M. P.
Tutte, Lt.-Col. H. C. (S.A.)

Urquhart, Norman C.

Vandervoort, Arthur E.
Van Koughnet, Arthur
Van Lane, J. F.
Van Nest, F. J.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Van Wart, Capt. Horace
Varty, W. George
Vaughan, J. J.
Vaughan, J. W.
Vetter, E. L.
Virgin, W. H.
Virtue, Roy A.
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Waddington, F. G.
Wagner, William A.
Waldie, R. S.
Waldruff, E. H.
Walker, Aitken
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Walker, Wm.
Wallace, Lt.-Col. Clifford S.
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walters, Chester
Walters, Fred Y.
Walton, Frederick
Walton, George E.
Ward, Rev. Canon J. E.
Wardropper, J.
Warmoll, C. R.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, Geo. R.
Warwick, R. D.
Waters, W. Keith
Waterston, Brig. E. J.
Watkins, William B.
Watson, George E.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Colonel W. H.
Watt, Donald R.
Watt, Gordon C.
Way, H. J.
Weale, W. H.
Weeks, A. L.
Weiner, Henry
Welch, Frank
Welch, Frank E.
Wells, E. F.
Wemp, Major Bert S.
West, Reg. C.
Westaway, J. W.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, John
Westwood, C. H.
Whelan, E.
Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
White, Andrew B.
White, Frank W.
White, H. F.
White, R. B.
White, Sir Thos.
Whiteley, J.
Whittaker, Harry
Wickware, Major R. A.
Wilbur, G. P.
Wildblood, G. W.
Wilgress, A. T.
Wilkes, Lt.-Col. F. Hilton
Wilkins, Cyril H.
Wilkinson, E. H.

Wilkinson, Rev. Canon F. H.
M.A., B.D.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, B. H.
Williams, Frank D.
Williams, H. H.
Williams, Dr. J. J.
Williams, Dr. J. P. F.
Williams, R. T.
Williamson, Rutherford
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willmot, Fred G.
Willoughby, V. W.
Wilson, Alex.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Alex. L.
Wilson, C. Lesslie
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, Hugh
Wilson, Lt.-Col. R. S.
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Winters, C. E.
Wolfson, Norman
Wood, L. M.
Wood, R. J.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H.F.D.
Woodland, J. C.
Woolnough, W. H.
Wright, D. G. H.
Wright, E. Frank
Wright G. K.
Wright, L. V.
Wright, Capt. Palmer
Wright, W. A.
Wrong, Dr. Norman
Wyatt H. L.
Wynston, Arthur L.

Young, Professor C. R.
Young, Cyril T.
Young Col. E. J.
Young, H. G.
Young, John A.
Young, T. S.
Young, W. T.